

THE Hongkong Weekly Press

AND

China Overland Trade Report.

Vol. XLVI.]

HONGKONG, WEDNESDAY, 21st JULY, 1897.

No. 4.

CONTENTS.

Epitome of the Week, &c.	61
Leading Articles:—	
The Gambling Law.....	62
The Women's Hospital and Nursing Institute ..	62
Chinese Shareholders in Public Companies	63
The Principles of French Diplomacy in China	64
Supreme Court	64
The Police Scandal.....	66
Hongkong Sanitary Board	73
The Indian Famine Fund.....	73
The Army and Navy and the Jubilee Review	73
The Accident to the late Mr. D. K. Sliman.....	74
Diamond Jubilee Subscriptions.....	74
The Empress of Japan's Quick Run	74
The Queen and Eureka Mines	74
Tebrau Planting Co., Limited	74
Correspondence	75
Horrible Outrage in Acheen	75
Death by Drowning of General De Badens.....	75
The Belgian Syndicate and its Contract	75
The Kind of Siam Changes his Plans	76
Hwai River Country	76
Attack on a Government Station in North Borneo ..	76
Hongkong and Port News.....	77
Commercial.....	78
Shipping	80

BIRTHS.

At Manila, on the 4th July, the wife of HERBERT H. TODD, of a son. [1848
On the 14th inst., at Merton Lodge, Richmond Road, the wife of WM. SHEWAN, of a daughter. [1832

DEATHS.

At No. 4, Elliot Crescent, at noon, 15th July, DELPHINE McLAREN, the much beloved daughter of DAVID E. and MARY McLAREN BROWN, aged 22 months and 14 days. [1846
Suddenly of heat apoplexy, on the 15th inst., at Kowloon Docks, COLIN D. MACLACHLAN, aged 38 years, chief engineer of the steamer *Methven Castle*. [656
At Shanghai, on the 10th July, JOHN JACKSON, Shipwright, Boyd & Co., Limited, late of Govan, Scotland, aged 37 years.
At Shanghai, on the 12th July, HEINRICH J. JÜRGENS, aged 72 years.

ARRIVALS OF MAILS.

The French mail of the 18th June arrived, per M. M. steamer *Salazie*, on the 17th July (29 days).

EPITOME OF THE WEEK.

Inspector Witchell, of the Hongkong Police Force, has been committed for trial on charges of neglecting to suppress gambling and receiving bribes.

Brigadier-General de Badens, commanding one of the military districts in Tonkin, has been drowned by the capsizing of a boat on the Claire River.

Captain Ronneaux, Paymaster of the 11th Regiment of Marine Infantry, stationed at Saigon, is to be court-martialled on a charge of embezzling 40,000 francs.

The duty question on yarn produced at the local mills has been arranged. The duty has to be paid on shipment, and the yarn then goes free and carries an exemption certificate.—*N. C. Daily News*.

Mr. H. T. Houghton, Acting Assistant Colonial Secretary and Clerk of Councils at Singapore, died on the 9th July, after a short illness.

The Court of Inquiry held at Singapore with reference to the loss of the steamer *Sri Hong Ann* censured the Captain, but did not deal with his certificate. The chinchew and owners were also censured.

H.E. Li Hung-chang having demurred, the sale of H.E. Sheng's big mill has, the *N. C. Daily News* says, fallen through, but the small mill of 25,000 spindles has been sold to the English syndicate for Tls. 500,000.

The proclamation of the Governor-General of the Philippines offering a free pardon to penitent rebels who surrendered has now been abrogated. The Manila papers continue to publish accounts of conflicts between the Spanish forces and scattered remnants of the rebels, but the rebellion as an organised movement is over.

A telegram in Australian papers states that Mr. Hooley has arranged through the British Foreign Office for the construction of railways in China at a cost of eight million pounds, Mr. Hooley may have ideas in that direction, but the statement that he has arranged for carrying them into effect is certainly premature. The *N. C. Daily News* is informed that one of the directors of the Hooley-Jameson Syndicate left London on the 11th July for Shanghai.

H.I.M. The Empress-Dowager, who had been staying at her favourite retreat Eho Park for the last three months, returned to her Peking Palace on the 1st instant. The Emperor and the whole Court, dressed in full Court costume, met Her Imperial Majesty at the Western Entrance of the "Forbidden City," and prostrated themselves as the Empress-Dowager's sedan-chair passed into the gates. Her Majesty will stay at Peking for a month and then return to Eho Park until the very hot weather is over.—*N. C. Daily News*.

The work on the Seoul Chemulpo railway is being vigorously pushed, says the *Korean Independent*, and as soon as the final surveying work is finished more men will be put to work. At present the graders are pushing the surveying party closely, being at work on the Chemulpo side of the pass, and from there to Chemulpo. The small Decauville construction track is laid from the outskirts of Chemulpo to a distance of about five miles from Chemulpo, most of the way now being continuous, with temporary trestles. The Korean coolies, it is said, are very satisfactory as workmen and are able to take small contracts for grading.

We mentioned in our issue of the 3rd inst., says the *Shanghai Daily Press*, that China will not use Russian money, though offered, for the building of her railways in Manchuria. We find our report corroborated by yesterday's (13th) *Shenpao*, which has a paragraph from its Peking correspondent to the same effect, with a further statement that after the Russian offer was declined the special Ambassador tried to get the Chinese to consent to build their railways with the same gauge as the Russian, thereby enabling the cars to cross each other's lines to the advantage of the commerce of both countries. The Peking Government has declined its consent to this proposal.

A Tokyo press despatch of the 6th July says it is reported that the Government has decided, with a view to encouraging the export trade, to abolish export duties on all goods on and after the 1st April next, whether the new Import Tariff has come into force by that time or not.

The following message has been received by their Majesties the Emperor and Empress of Japan from Her Majesty Queen Victoria:—"I heartily thank your Majesties for having sent H.I.H. Prince Arisugawa to attend the celebration of the 60th anniversary of my accession to the throne, and I express my sincere appreciation of the handsome presents your Majesties have sent me through his Imperial Highness."

Official information received at Manila confirms the reports previously published as to the disastrous character of the eruption of the Mayon Volcano. Lava covered the whole mountain to its base and the obscuration of the sun by the clouds of ashes was so great that in the neighbourhood of the disaster artificial light had to be used at three o'clock in the afternoon. Several villages were completely destroyed. At Libog a hundred and fifteen bodies were recovered and buried, and more remained in the lava. At another place two hundred persons were missing. Some of the bodies recovered were so completely calcined as to be unrecognisable.

The Viceroy of Nanking, well knowing that the consumption of coal on board the Nanyang squadron forms one of the most profitable sources of remuneration to native commanders, has instructed Liu Taotai to appoint two officials to strictly ascertain the actual amount of fuel necessary for each of the ships according to horse-power. The first man-of-war to be so enquired into is the *Wantai*, which is being commissioned for a long cruise. It is thought by many that the commanders must have incurred in some way the displeasure of some of the Viceroy's underlings, to have this business, which they have enjoyed for years, suddenly brought to the notice of Li Kunyi.—*Mercury*.

The genial General Jones, U.S. Consul at Chinkiang, has written a comprehensive report on the Yangtze Valley and with the poet's eye he surveys the future:—"One can picture the Yangtze bearing lumberless steam craft of every description laden with valuable products of foreign and native industry, their decks crowded with passengers from the teeming millions of the adjacent provinces; the cities on its banks densely populated, and the people active, happy, and prosperous; foreign machinery and implements developing the unlimited resources of their fields and hills. Railways running north and south through the land will connect, by means of steam ferries, across the river; on the innumerable canals and inland waterways, the steam passenger-boat will supplant the tardy and unsafe sampan; specially constructed fast passenger steamers, running frequently during the day, will carry their human freights; and finally, the American flag will, it is to be hoped, once more be proudly and prominently displayed on this great waterway, from which it should never have withdrawn. This prospect is but a logical result of freeing the Chinese people from their present burden of taxation and opening the whole country to foreign trade."

THE GAMBLING LAW.

If any of our Legislative Councillors want a profitable hour's reading we would commend to their attention the debates which took place in the Legislative Council in 1891 upon the Gambling Bill. Especially would we ask the Hon. C. P. CHATER and the Hon. T. H. WHITEHEAD to devote a little time to the study of this question. Neither of the hon. gentlemen had very much to say on the subject themselves, but what little they did say was to the effect that gambling was a crying evil, that something should be done, and therefore let us have a Bill. Well, we got a Bill, and here we are, six years later, in a worse position than ever, the public service honeycombed with corruption, and gambling rife amongst all classes of the population, native and foreign. Again it will be said that something must be done, and in the interests of the colony at large we would earnestly implore the unofficial members of Council to take the trouble to think the whole matter out for themselves on independent lines and not to accept on trust any Bill that the officials may lay before them.

In the course of the debates referred to an interesting and concise summary of the history of the gambling question was given by the Hon. W. M. DEANE, at that time Acting Colonial Secretary, but whose substantive office was that of Captain Superintendent of Police. In 1865 gambling was rampant, said Mr. DEANE, and the corruption of the police was notorious. Inspectors were paid \$2½ per month for each house opened. Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL thought it necessary to adopt regulations for the control of the vice and a certain number of gambling houses were licensed, but these regulations were the subject of much censure in England, and they had to be withdrawn. Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL steadily denied that the regulations had any reference to revenue, and Mr. DEANE in the course of his speech expressed the opinion that if the revenue had not been so great not so much would have been heard about the matter. After the abolition of the licensing system the suppression of gambling fell into the hands of the Registrar-General and the Captain Superintendent of Police. For a time gambling was brought into what Mr. DEANE described as "moderate compass;" but then, he continued, "one or two 'unfortunate events' occurred. One of 'the inspectors was suspected of being 'bought over, and then another Governor 'arrived with an entirely new policy.' The Governor referred to was the late Sir JOHN POPE HENNESSY, whose orders, according to Mr. DEANE, were, 'Leave the 'Chinese alone. Let them gamble in peace 'except in notorious cases.' After that Chinese clubs, so-called, were established in large numbers, which were really gambling houses under another name, and in 1891 the law now in force was passed for the purpose of suppressing those establishments and all forms of public gambling. For a time the new law appeared to be successful, until the parties concerned had time to look round and take their bearings under the new conditions. Then, finding the house swept and garnished, the evil spirit returned, bringing with him seven others.

To make matters clear to those who may not have studied the gambling question it may be convenient to note the distinction between public and private gambling. If a party of friends sit down to a game of cards and play for money, the chances of all being equal, that is private gambling,

of which the law takes no cognisance; but if there is a banker, or a master of the game, who takes a commission on the winnings and runs the establishment for a profit, it becomes public gambling. There is no moral distinction between public and private gambling, but the former is deemed inexpedient in the public interests, on the ground that it encourages vice and leads to crime. It is therefore as a question of expediency, rather than as a question of morals, that the subject must be discussed, and looked at in that light we maintain that Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL's system of licensing a limited number of gambling houses and so bringing the vice under control is the best that could be devised. Suppression is absolutely hopeless and must inevitably lead to corruption in the public service. We have no wish to palliate the offence of accepting bribes, but we can understand that a policeman who could not under any circumstances be induced to connive at a robbery might think it not quite the same thing to take a bribe in respect of gambling, when he knows that gambling will go on whether he interferes with it or not, and when he knows also that gambling in one form or another is indulged in by all classes of the population, European and Chinese alike. Where bribes are freely offered the strain is too great to be uniformly resisted by men in receipt of small salaries when it is not an actual crime that is in question.

The gambling law of 1891 was introduced during the absence of the then Governor, Sir WILLIAM DES VŒUX, who returned while it was still before the Council. His Excellency then said he must confess the experience he had had in various parts of the world made him very sceptical about the practical effect for good of any gambling law; he had seen gambling laws tried in various places, and he was bound to say that as far as he could see they had had very little or no effect; and he referred to the feverish gambling spirit that prevails in England, notwithstanding all the laws passed for the suppression of gambling. His Excellency expressed himself in somewhat similar terms at meeting after meeting, but the conclusion at which he finally arrived was that if it were a question of beginning legislation he would decline to do anything in the absence of special instructions, but as they had at present on the statute book a law which had become almost utterly useless he intended to proceed with the Bill, because it could not make matters worse than they were and might make them better. "There 'is only one point," His Excellency continued, "as to which I was for a 'long time doubtful, and that is the ques- 'tion of corruption. . . . It has been 'suggested, I fear not altogether without 'ground, that there is a large amount of 'corruption. Yet we are not certain about 'it. This law will enable us to be certain. 'If the gambling in particular places is not 'put an end to we shall know that the 'corruption exists, and either it will have 'to be corrected or the law will have to be 'given up altogether. It may be that 'the inducements to gambling are so 'great that no salaries we are able 'to pay will be sufficient to procure 'men who will altogether administer the law 'against gamblers with strict impartiality. 'Of course I know there are in the present 'police force men who, although they are 'in a humble position, would firmly resist 'offers to be bribed. I know there are such 'men and that they have resisted such 'offers, but taking an ordinary view

"it is a question whether men at such 'salaries as can be given in the police 'force, the average man, would be able 'to resist the large sums which it might 'pay gamblers to offer." The Hon. HO KAI in the same debate also expressed the apprehension that to increase the stringency of the law would increase corruption in the police force. That apprehension has been fulfilled, and it is evident our legislation on the subject will have to be revised. It seems to us there are only two alternatives: either to license a certain number of gambling houses, as under Sir RICHARD MACDONNELL's system, by which the evil of public gambling, though not suppressed, can be controlled and kept within bounds, or to give up interference with it altogether. The decision rests with the Colonial Office, and the matter should be presented to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in that light. Perhaps home opinion might be shocked, but, as to one of the alternatives, it might be pointed out that the home Government has condemned the colony to free trade in sexual vice with its attendant dangers to the public health, and that free trade in gambling would be a lesser evil, and that the attempt to suppress gambling fails in its object and corrupts the public service.

THE WOMEN'S HOSPITAL AND NURSING INSTITUTE.

A Hospital for Women and Children with a Nursing Institute attached has been decided upon as one of Hongkong's memorials of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, and the foundation stone was duly laid by His Excellency the Governor on the second day of the Jubilee holidays. The plan of the building is reported to have been settled, but neither the principle nor the details of the scheme under which the institution is to be worked have, so far as is known, yet been decided upon, or, at all events, they have not been published. Is the hospital to be maintained for paying patients, or for necessitous cases only, or for both? And on what terms are the services of the nurses to be available? These are questions that naturally suggest themselves, and which the community would naturally like to have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon.

At Shanghai a Nursing Home was established in the latter part of last year, three sisters being brought out from England. When the question of establishing a Diamond Jubilee memorial arose the decision of the Model Settlement was in favour of a British Nursing Institute. It is now proposed that the existing experimental Nurses' Home should be taken as the nucleus of the proposed British Diamond Jubilee Victoria Nursing Institute and that the Institute should be amalgamated with the General Hospital with a view to improving the nursing of that institution. The present nurses are members of a French charitable order, whose religious obligations interfere in some directions with what are usually considered the duties of nurses. It appears, however, the nursing has been carried on by the same Order ever since the foundation of the hospital, and, on the whole, with satisfaction to the patients and their friends. But when the hospital was established trained nurses were not available; in the interval which has since elapsed great advances have been made in the art of nursing, and it is perhaps not unnatural that our Shanghai friends, while recognising the good work done by the French sisters in the past, should wish to bring the arrangements of their hospital more up to date. That, however, is a local question for Shanghai; on

which we will not venture an opinion; our purpose is rather to direct attention to one or two points upon which Shanghai's experience may with advantage be considered by Hongkong.

From an article in the *China Gazette* we learn that the receipts of the Experimental Nursing Home for the first half of the present year were Tls. 665, while the expenditure amounted to about Tls. 2,000. The figures for the short time the institution was in operation in 1896 are also given, but they include all the preliminary expenses, while the income had scarcely commenced, so that it would serve no useful purpose to introduce them here. At the commencement of the present year, however, the institution was in full working order, and, contrary to expectations, it has failed to cover its working expenses, showing instead a loss of some Tls. 1,300 for the half-year. Whether this loss was caused by the scale of fees being too low, by the nurses not having been fully employed, or by their having been engaged on necessitous non-paying cases is not stated. Information on these points would be useful in arranging the working scheme of the Hongkong Nursing Institute.

In the same article our contemporary gives the receipts and expenditure of the Shanghai General Hospital, which, it appears, is more than self-supporting. In 1896 the receipts were Tls. 27,034. Of this sum Tls. 2,000 were contributed by the General Municipal Council; and Tls. 1,000 by the French Council. These donations, however, are after all more apparent than real, as we find that only Tls. 776 of the Tls. 2,000 remained after the cost of treating and maintaining poor patients sent in by the General Municipal Council, and Tls. 297 out of the Tls. 1,000 on account of patients sent in by the French Municipal Council. The total amount contributed by paying patients during the year was Tls. 25,317 out of the Tls. 27,034. Against this, the expenditure was Tls. 20,925, leaving a balance of Tls. 5,984 to the credit of the Hospital upon the year's working. The Hospital grant to the ten nursing Sisters of Charity for the year is Tls. 2,000; to the Physician (non-resident) Tls. 1,800; to the Secretary Tls. 600; pay to two European warders Tls. 933, making in all Tls. 5,633 for the working staff. From the above figures it would seem that the Shanghai General Hospital is maintained mainly by and for paying patients, and we believe we are correct in saying that the patients may be and in most cases are attended by their own doctors. The Hongkong Government Civil Hospital is on a different basis. That institution was originally intended for the medical treatment of officers and sailors of the mercantile marine, members of the Colonial Government Service, and those suffering from accidents brought in by the Police. Provision is, however, made for private paying patients, and there has been an increasing demand upon it by this class, especially since the introduction of lady nurses. The annual expenses of the Hospital come to between sixty and seventy thousand dollars per annum. In 1895 the number of patients treated was 2,283, of whom 498 were private paying patients. The fees received from the latter amounted to \$15,395. Unlike the Shanghai General Hospital, in the Hongkong Government Civil Hospital private practitioners are not allowed to treat patients. Thus if a patient of Dr. X, unable to obtain proper nursing in his own quarters, has to go into the hospital, Dr. X loses the case and the attendant fees, which go to the Government; whereas the Shanghai Hospital may be regarded as a co-operative

institution in which all the practitioners of the place are on an equal footing and manage their own cases, except that one of them draws an honorarium of Tls. 1,800 for treating destitutes and superintending the general arrangements.

The reception of private paying patients by the Government Civil Hospital has always, we understand, been regarded by the private practitioners of Hongkong as an unfair competition, but one which they were not inclined to resent while the nursing advantages were in a large number of cases so much greater than could be obtained outside. For some years past, however, a private hospital has been successfully conducted at the Peak, and it is believed that had it not been for the competition of the Government Civil Hospital a hospital for paying patients, to which any doctor might send his cases and where he might treat them himself, would long ago have been established. So far as the patients themselves are concerned, it is hardly conceivable that they could be better off than in the admirably conducted Government institution, except perhaps in the matter of site and surroundings; but it would seem that the time has arrived when the advisability of the Government's continuing its competition with private practitioners should be taken into serious consideration. The European community is rapidly growing, and is likely to grow more rapidly in the future. It is hardly possible that the Government can go on extending its accommodation for private paying patients indefinitely, but while the competition of the Government exists no one else is likely to supply it, except on a comparatively small scale, whereas if the Government competition ceased a self-supporting institution for private paying patients might be established on Bowen Road, or at the Peak, or in some other eligible locality away from the Chinese surroundings of the Government Civil Hospital.

The question suggests itself, then, is the Hospital for Women and Children that has been decided upon as a memorial of the Queen's long reign to be used solely for necessitous cases, or is it to compete with the midwifery practice of the private practitioners of the colony? If the hospital caters for paying patients it will no doubt receive them in considerable numbers, and necessitous cases may be crowded out. The subscriptions to the memorial poured in in a fervour of loyalty without any very precise understanding as to the real scope and object of the hospital, but before proceeding further in the matter it might be well to have this point fully discussed and cleared up; otherwise we may have, in the future, controversy, dissatisfaction, and accusations that the institution has been diverted from its proper purpose.

CHINESE SHAREHOLDERS IN PUBLIC COMPANIES.

In the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee of the Shanghai General Chamber of Commerce reference is made to the refusal of the Taotai to entertain claims for calls made upon Chinese shareholders in the Bank of China and Japan, Limited. Having considered a letter from the Acting Manager of the Bank at Shanghai, the Committee resolved to address the Senior Consul on the subject, without entering into the particulars of the Bank case, "pointing out the gravity of the situation, in that the decision of the Taotai imperilled all transactions between Chinese and foreigners." In that, we

think, the Committee has somewhat overshoot the mark, as also has our Shanghai morning contemporary, which, in an article on the subject, says:—"We hear a great deal of the perfect trustworthiness of the Chinese in commercial matters; a late manager here of the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank made a statement publicly once on the subject that has become classical; but the Taotai's decision upsets this altogether." The question of the liability of Chinese shareholders in Public Companies registered under English law, or the law of any other country, is a very important one and must be pressed to a satisfactory conclusion, but it is a mistake to say that because in the meantime the Chinese Courts refuse to recognise Company law all transactions between Chinese and foreigners are imperilled, or to say that the question has any bearing on Chinese commercial morality. It may be safely said that there is not a single English shareholder in the Bank who would not gladly avail himself of any legal loop-hole to evade payment of calls to liquidate its indebtedness. The feeling of Imuris shareholders under somewhat similar circumstances is notorious. Also, as regards the Bank of China and Japan, an American shareholder has so far successfully resisted a suit brought against him for the payment of calls; but an appeal in that case is, we believe, still pending, and it remains to be seen whether the shareholder will be successful in the ultimate result. Assuming that he is successful, however, no one would dream of making his case an occasion for impugning American commercial morality. The ground of the decision given in the United States Consular Court at Shanghai was that the shareholder was absolved owing to what the Court held to be the illegal action of the directors. In the case of the Chinese shareholders the Taotai holds the participation of Chinese in foreign Company enterprise to be illegal *ab initio* and he refuses to entertain any claim against them arising out of such participation, or to assist them in prosecuting any claim against the Company, apparently for similar reasons to those on which an English Court declines to enter into the merits of a dispute arising out of an illegal contract, as, for instance, a gambling debt or a contract for the sale and purchase of slaves. Nor is the decision of the Taotai more absurd, looked at simply from a common sense point of view, than was that of the French Consular Court given some four years ago to the effect that a French shareholder in the Bank of China and Japan was not liable for calls because the Bank had not complied with all the requirements of French Company law. Our contemporary accepted that decision at the time as quite regular. The decision, it may be remarked, was reversed on appeal to the Court at Saigon. It is very necessary, also, that a reversal of the Taotai's decision should be secured and that Chinese shareholders should be compelled to fulfil their contracts in respect of the payment of calls, but in the meantime the case as it stands does not afford just ground for a general attack upon the commercial morality of the Chinese, nor has it any bearing upon the sanctity of contracts for the sale and purchase of merchandise, as the remarks of the Committee of the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce would seem to imply.

We (*Japan Gazette*) hear on good authority that H.M.S. *Powerful* left England on June 29th for the Far East and is expected to join the China Squadron in time for the regatta at Vladivostok on August 27th.

THE PRINCIPLES OF FRENCH DIPLOMACY IN CHINA.

20th July.

A VERY frank confession of the aims and principles actuating French diplomacy in China is made by the *Avenir du Tonkin*. Our contemporary's text is the alleged new Franco-Chinese convention. A short time ago news was received through REUTER that M. GERARD had succeeded in obtaining further concessions from China, but this statement was contradicted the other day by the *N. C. Daily News*, which stated that the only foundation for the report was the fact that M. GERARD had been trying to secure such concessions. Whatever the truth may be on this point, we have no doubt that our Tonkin contemporary is quite correct in its description of M. GERARD's attitude. The Minister, says the *Avenir*, in his relations with the Government to which he is accredited works on a fixed principle, and that is that France should always be considered as the most privileged nation. Thus he never allows the least opportunity to pass without making it understood that any favour accorded to another country must be immediately counter-balanced by advantages given to France. The negotiation of the late Treaty was a case of tit for tat, a blow aimed at the ambitions of England in connection with the privileges recently obtained by that country. The authorisation given to France to penetrate into Yunnan corresponds to the rectification of the Burmah frontier; to the opening of the West River corresponds the prolongation of French railways into Kwangsi even to Nanning-fu, the most important place on the river from a commercial point of view. Our contemporary further says it is amusing to watch the steeplechase which France and England are running in China. Amusing it may be, but it is a pity our French contemporaries cannot recognise that the race, if race it can be called, should be conducted on equal terms. As the *Avenir* says, France always wants to be the most favoured nation, in other words, to have her competitors handicapped. England, on the other hand, from the commencement of foreign intercourse with China, has never sought to secure any exceptional advantage for herself. Every privilege she has secured has been secured equally for all the Treaty Powers, France included, whereas the object of France is to shut out other Powers, especially England. If the advance of France meant the opening of new markets to the trade of the whole world she would carry with her the hearty good wishes of England in all her colonial enterprises.

SUPREME COURT.

14th July.

IN APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

BEFORE THE FULL COURT—SIR JOHN CARRINGTON (CHIEF JUSTICE) AND MR. A. G. WISE (PUISNE JUDGE.)

W. JACKSON, APPELLANT, v. A. PRIDDLE, RESPONDENT.

Plaintiff moved for leave to appeal from the decision of the Puisse Judge in an action brought against the defendant for the recovery of a bull terrier dog.

Mr. M. W. Slade (instructed by Mr. C. D. Wilkinson) appeared for the appellant and Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C., (instructed by Mr. J. Hastings) represented the respondent.

The appellant's application to extend the time for the making of the motion was taken first.

Mr. Slade submitted that the appellant had used due diligence in getting the truth to enable him to bring the motion before the Court. He had written to Shanghai to the man Allinson, who had filed two affidavits, the second one of which stated that the dog was found by him at the end of September or the beginning of October, whereas the respondent's case was that he did not receive the dog until January of this year. The delay was a genuine one and was caused by Mr. Jackson's endeavour to arrive at the truth of the matter. Counsel therefore contended that the Court should grant the extra time.

The Puisse Judge pointed out that the appellant could have filed a motion within the seven days. Many motions had been filed simply for the purpose of keeping cases alive.

Mr. Slade said the appellant did not know what the evidence of Allinson was until he received the second affidavit. Counsel concluded his argument by saying that if their Lordships declined to grant the application they would allow a lying defence to prevail against a perfectly honest man.

Mr. Francis said that in reference to the *bona fides* of the appellant it seemed to him that there were very grave mistakes—to put it mildly—in the affidavit and that Mr. Jackson had been in communication with Allinson long before he had stated.

The Chief Justice pointed out that, in reference to the question of time, the affidavits must be taken as they stood.

Mr. Francis then submitted that the appellant had not been diligent and had not dealt honestly with the Court. But apart from all that, counsel contended that there was no ground for the extension of time, which should not be given unless there had been some mistake or misapprehension either on the part of the applicant or his solicitor which prevented him from entering his appeal in due course. The respondent was in a position to show that the affidavit was not correct and counsel asked for permission to cross-examine Mr. Jackson on the affidavit.

Mr. Slade having replied their Lordships retired.

On returning into court after a few minutes' absence the Chief Justice said—This is an application to the discretion of the Court to extend the time for the making of a motion asking leave to appeal against a judgment of the Puisse Judge sitting in the Summary Jurisdiction of the Court. The application is made under section 41 of the Supreme Court (Summary Jurisdiction) Ordinance, 14 of 1873. That section reads as follows:—"The Puisse Judge of the Supreme Court shall, as a general rule, preside at the hearing of all suits in its summary jurisdiction; and in case either party shall be dissatisfied with his decision of any question of fact or of law arising in the case, he may within seven days from the date of the judgment apply to the Full Court in its original jurisdiction for leave to appeal, and the Full Court may grant leave to appeal on such terms as to notice and other matters as it may, in its discretion, think fit: provided always that the Full Court may, in its discretion, extend the time hereby limited for such application either before or after the expiration thereof." In this case the judgment from which it is sought to obtain leave to appeal was pronounced on the 20th May last, and the notice of motion was filed on the 1st July last. It may be taken, for the purpose of the present hearing, that the application for the extension of time was also filed on the 1st July. Then the question arises whether or not the appellant has brought himself within the terms of the proviso and has appealed to the Court in such a way as to enable it to exercise its discretion in his favour. We think that the principles on which that discretion should be exercised are pretty much the same as those which guide the High Court of Justice—the Court of Appeal—at home in dealing with an application of a like nature—an application to bring forward a motion although the time fixed by the rules has expired. The Court, before granting any such application, has to be satisfied, I think, that the party has acted *bona fide* and has shown due diligence in his proceedings in reference to the matter before the Court. Now with regard to the question of *bona fide* I think, so far as the materials before the Court go, there is no reason why the Court should think that the

appellant in this case has not acted *bona fide*. That observation, of course, must be made subject to the question of the cross-examination of the appellant on his affidavit. That cross-examination may or may not show that he did not act *bona fide*, but, without deciding the question as to the cross-examination, I do not think there is any ground for the Court to take it that the appellant has not acted *bona fide* in this matter. The question is whether he has shown due diligence in moving the Court for this extension of time. The period that has elapsed since the statutory time expired is some weeks. That is a long time on the face of it, and I think the Court must carefully watch proceedings under this proviso and make sure that it carries out this power according to judicial rules. Has the appellant, then, acted in such a way as to show the Court that he has proceeded with due diligence in collecting evidence and bringing that evidence before the Court? We come to the conclusion, and with some regret, that he has not done so, that too long a period of time has elapsed, and that he has not occupied that period of time so profitably as he might have done, to induce the Court to exercise its discretion in his favour. In the first instance, the appellant might easily, one would think, have obtained evidence as to the whereabouts of Mr. Allinson within an earlier period than the eight days which elapsed after the judgment. Mr. Allinson was employed in the Ordnance Store Department. The appellant might have gone there and ascertained what had become of him. We think it is very likely that the Ordnance Store Department would have told him that he had gone into the employment of the Imperial Maritime Customs. After he learnt that, he could easily have ascertained from the head of the Imperial Maritime Customs here at what port Allinson was stationed. Within seven days he might have ascertained where Allinson was. At all events he could have ascertained within eight days of the delivery of the judgment. What was his right and reasonable course? I think, and my learned brother thinks, too, that his proper course was at once—the time being gone by one day—to have filed an application to appeal and to have stated to the Court that he was quite sure that the dog was his, that Allinson was the person who could support the contention that the dog was his, and that he was quite ready to act on Allinson's evidence as far as he could judge. Then the Court, with these materials before it, would no doubt have extended the time for him to file his notice of motion for leave to appeal within a reasonable time—say a month or something of that kind—in which he could communicate with Allinson and obtain Allinson's statement. That would have placed him in the right. He would then clearly have been able to proceed in due course and would have been showing due diligence. If he did not do that we think if, when he got Allinson's first affidavit in which it was stated that Allinson found the dog, although the date was not mentioned, he should have moved on that affidavit for an extension of time. The statement when the dog was found clearly went to bear out that it was appellant's dog that was lost, and he might have come to the Court and said "Here is Allinson who found the dog," and he could have asked the Court to extend the time in order that Allinson might make a further affidavit respecting the actual date. I think the Court might have granted an extension of time under those circumstances. Well, then, he did not act in either of these ways, and it appears to us that he took much of his leisure in communicating with Allinson. We are not quite satisfied that he acted so promptly as he should have done. It is only a four days' passage to Shanghai and there is frequent communication. Therefore we do not think, on the whole, that the suffering of some six weeks to elapse from the expiration of the time allowed by law is reasonably accounted for. We think he should have been able to come before this Court for an extension of time sooner than he has, even if he did not act in either of the ways I have suggested. Therefore we arrive at the conclusion—although with some regret, because we think that Allinson was undoubtedly a material witness and it was desirable that his evidence should be obtained—having regard to all the circumstances, that the appellant has not acted with due diligence in this matter and

has not shown any reason why the Court should exercise its discretion in granting an extension of time. Therefore we think the application must be refused.

The Puisne Judge—I concur, although with considerable reluctance.

Mr. Francis asked for costs of the motion.

The Chief Justice—Yes, we think costs must follow the motion. Strictly speaking, the motion for granting leave to appeal does not come before us.

Mr. Francis asked for all costs arising out of that motion.

Mr. Slade contended there should be only one bill of costs.

The Chief Justice—We think, on the whole, the most convenient course will be to grant costs on the whole of these proceedings so far as the motion as originally made is concerned. As a matter of form it will be better to order the dismissal of the motion for leave to appeal with costs.

The Court then adjourned.

19th July.

CRIMINAL SESSIONS.

BEFORE SIR JOHN CARRINGTON (CHIEF JUSTICE).

CHARGE OF RAPE.

Mr. Robinson—I wish to make an application on behalf of Mr. Francis, who is appearing for the Attorney-General elsewhere and who is engaged in the case against Ross. In regard to that case I ask that a special jury be summoned, if the Attorney-General does not object. The Attorney-General does not wish the case to come on to-day and I would ask your Lordship to fix a day for the hearing.

The Attorney-General—I can take it now if you like, but for the convenience of Mr. Francis I am willing to let it stand over.

His Lordship fixed Monday, the 26th inst., for the hearing of the case.

Mr. Robinson—Will your lordship order a special jury to be empanelled?

His Lordship—Yes.

THE ARSON CASE.

Mr. Robinson—Can the Attorney-General say if the arson case that is on the calendar will be taken to-day?

The Attorney-General—I do not think so. To-morrow we can fix it for this day week, subject to any application in the meantime. Mr. Francis appears for the defendant and I do not wish to hurry the case when he is not here.

PIRACY.

Wong Yam was charged on three counts with robbery with violence on the 2nd June. The Attorney-General (instructed by Mr. H. L. Dennys, Crown Solicitor), prosecuted.

The following jury was empanelled to try the case—L. Martel, H. U. Jefferies, B. M. Vieira, D. Goh, C. A. Brockelmann, J. C. L. Rouch, and A. Kuhn.

The Attorney-General briefly stated the facts of the case to the jury. On the night of the assault a large junk was anchored about half-a-mile outside Stonecutters' Island and inside the harbour limits. She was anchored there for the night, having been working in the vicinity during the day. On board the junk were the master and his wife and about twenty others, including the crew. At about nine o'clock the master went to sleep at the stern of the junk and his wife retired for the night to the cabin. He was awakened about midnight by a noise and on getting up saw two men— it would be proved that the prisoner was one— rushing towards him from the fore part of the junk. The master ran to his cabin and barred the door, but the two men followed, and with revolvers in hand, demanded admittance. Once inside they ransacked the cabin, and in addition to taking every moveable thing of value they tore the ear-rings and jewellery from the master's wife. By this time the crew had heard the disturbance, but in order that no alarm should be raised the two men drove them all into one cabin, shut the door, and placed a quantity of gun powder outside, telling them that if they dared to open the door the powder would be fired and the place blown up.

On leaving the junk the pirates carried away with them the younger brother of the master.

The Attorney-General called the master of the junk and other witnesses to prove the identification of the prisoner.

The jury found the prisoner guilty and the judge sentenced him to six years' hard labour.

A GRAVE CHARGE.

Kaiser Singh was charged with attempting to commit an unnatural offence.

The following jury were empanelled:— Messrs. E. J. Moses, J. Motabhoj, F. M. da Luz, P. P. Soares, J. F. Foyun, H. A. W. Slade, and A. A. dos Remedios.

After hearing the evidence the jury found the prisoner guilty and he was sentenced to five years' hard labour.

15th July.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. A. G. WISE (PUISNE JUDGE.)

JOHNSON, STOKES, AND MASTER V. GROSSMAN AND CO.

Plaintiffs, who are solicitors in the colony, sued the defendants, who are merchants, for \$338.50, being fees for work done and money expended as solicitors for the defendants, for which sum signed detailed bills were delivered to the defendants in March, 1897.

Mr. Dennys appeared for the plaintiffs and Mr. Reece for the defendants.

Mr. Dennys said the writ was issued on the 16th June last and on the 1st July he received notice from Mr. Reece stating that the sum of \$240 had been paid into court by the defendants in full satisfaction of the claim. On the 14th July, Mr. Reece sent a notice in the following terms:—"Take notice that on the hearing of this suit defendants will, amongst other defences, enter into the special defence of set off, the plaintiffs being indebted to the defendants in the sum of \$84 for liquidated damages in respect of the plaintiff's negligence in not acting on the instructions to obtain from Mr. Ferdinand Bornemann the full amount of costs as between solicitor and client." Mr. Dennys said this put him in a curious position. His clients were most anxious not to take advantage of any technical objection to this defence, but the plaintiffs were, by this special defence, charged with negligence. Therefore, as the defendants were suing for \$84 for liquidated damages—whatever that might mean—and were charging the plaintiffs with negligence, the defendants had to prove that negligence to the satisfaction of the Court and therefore they should open the case.

Mr. Reece replied that he was not suing for negligence. The suit was brought in respect of three bills of costs, and his friend would not dispute that two of the bills had been disposed of, the amount at which they had been taxed having been paid to plaintiffs' solicitors.

Mr. Dennys admitted that \$84 was practically the amount he was suing for.

Mr. Reece said two of the bills had been disposed of.

Mr. Dennys replied that they were not disposed of. Money had been paid into court, but that was a different thing altogether.

Mr. Reece—They are disposed of in this way, that no question is before your Lordship as to either of these two bills. The only question is whether the defendants are liable to pay to the plaintiffs \$84, the balance of the third bill. The two bills having been taxed at \$240, that sum has been paid into Court.

His Lordship—It appears to me that the point is—of course I have only heard of this special defence of yours—that you are going to charge—

Mr. Reece—I do not make any charge whatever. As a matter of defence I have raised that point.

His Lordship—You say "liquidated damages in respect of the negligence." What I want to ask is, is that brought properly before me in the way of set off? Ought it not to be a cross action?

Mr. Reece—Has your Lordship the bill for \$184? That bill is in respect of a dispute between Messrs. Grossman & Co. and Bornemann as to certain trade marks. It was alleged that Bornemann had infringed certain trade

marks of Grossmann & Co., and the bill is in connection with work done in that dispute. It appears from the bill that the dispute was compromised and it was compromised on certain terms. One of the terms was that Mr. Bornemann should pay \$100 costs. It was not exactly that, but the terms were that Mr. Bornemann should pay the costs of Messrs. Grossmann and Co. not exceeding \$100. The bill amounted to \$184 and Mr. Bornemann paid \$100, and the sole question is whether the defendants are or are not liable to pay \$84, the balance of that account. Plaintiffs, I submit, have to prove that this bill was delivered and that the work was done, and it is for them to prove their claim. With respect to the notice of special defence of course that is only one of the defences which the defendants will raise. The defendants may put their defence in several ways and one way is that plaintiffs, having been instructed to obtain the full amount of costs from Mr. Bornemann, only obtained \$100 and that, assuming the defendants are liable for \$84, the defendants have a set off because the plaintiffs did not obey the instructions of Messrs. Grossmann and Co. in obtaining the full amount of costs from Mr. Bornemann.

His Lordship—Ought that defence to be raised as a set-off?

Mr. Reece—If your Lordship thinks it better I will bring a cross suit.

His Lordship—It raises a very vital principle.

Mr. Reece—I say that the transactions and the conduct of the plaintiffs amounted to this, that there was an agreement, either expressed or implied, that if they got the full costs from Mr. Bornemann, not exceeding \$100, they would not charge—

His Lordship—It appears to me that I must have a separate action and pleadings.

Mr. Reece—I do not see that that is necessary.

His Lordship—I do. It is a very serious charge indeed. I am not going to take it as a set off. If you say there was a distinct agreement and that there was anything in the nature of negligence I must have it all before me.

Mr. Reece—That is only one way of putting the defence. It is not culpable negligence.

Mr. Dennys—Then it is nothing. It must be gross negligence or nothing.

His Lordship—I think, Mr. Reece, you will admit that a claim for damages for negligence against a firm of solicitors is a very serious matter.

Mr. Reece—Yes, if it stood by itself, but it is put forward as a matter of defence. I do not consider it is a serious matter at all.

Mr. Dennys—I consider it is a most serious matter.

His Lordship—My opinion is, simply on reading this special defence, that there is a charge of a very serious nature made against a firm of solicitors, whether rightly or wrongly I do not know, but I do not think it is a proper thing to be decided on a set off. You have other defences?

Mr. Reece—Yes.

His Lordship—Would you like to withdraw that special defence? If you want to keep it on the file I think there ought to be a cross action.

Mr. Reece—I am instructed to withdraw that defence.

His Lordship—If you withdraw it I cannot allow you to go into the question of negligence.

Mr. Reece—As to what instructions were given I am entitled to go into that evidence.

His Lordship—Then keep it on the file and proceed by cross action. I will give you time to bring it.

Mr. Reece—I withdraw that special defence, but it is quite open to me to prove what the instructions of my client were.

His Lordship—If you are going to have any negligence in the matter it is a charge that will have to be fought out in a separate action, and I cannot allow you to go on with this action.

Mr. Reece—Then I will withdraw the notice of special defence altogether.

Mr. Dennys then explained the facts of the case and said the only question now was whether or not the defendants were indebted to the plaintiffs on three signed bills of costs that were delivered to them on the 10th March, 1897. Two of the bills had been taxed and plaintiffs now sought to recover \$84 in addition to the \$240

paid into court. The agreement spoken of arose in this way. There is in the colony a man named Bornemann, who deals in cigarette papers, which he made up in little coloured wrappers and sold in boxes. Mr. Grossmann represented a European firm and he complained that the wrapper in which these things were made up was an infringement of the trade mark he was using. Mr. Bornemann denied that and also denied that Mr. Grossmann had any right whatever to say anything at all because he was not registered in Hongkong as the owner of the trade marks which he claimed; in addition, Mr. Bornemann said the trade marks which he was using were not infringements of the trade marks spoken of by Mr. Grossmann. Mr. Bornemann did not want to have any law suit and he agreed to come to terms. He undertook not to use the labels, although he did not believe that the trade marks were those of Mr. Grossmann. Mr. Bornemann offered \$35 to settle the question of costs, but Mr. Grossmann, or his solicitors (the plaintiffs), refused to accept \$35 and said they would accept \$100. Mr. Grossmann, however, made further alterations in the agreement and the costs were increased to \$184. Mr. Bornemann paid \$100 of this in accordance with the terms, but Mr. Grossmann refused to pay the remaining \$84. The plaintiffs would say that they never for a moment promised or agreed with Mr. Grossmann that they would only charge him the costs they could get from the other side. They never thought of the question at all and it was not raised in any way.

Mr. Gedge, solicitor in the office of Messrs. Johnson, Stokes, and Master, was then called. He said that Mr. Grossmann went to him in reference to his claim against Mr. Bornemann in reference to the infringement of trade marks. On the 23rd December witness wrote to Mr. Bornemann's solicitor threatening legal proceedings.

His Lordship (to Mr. Dennys)—The solicitor was you?

Mr. Dennys—Yes.

Witness, continuing in answer to Mr. Dennys, said Mr. Dennys wrote stating that he could not see the difference between the flying lion sitting on a volcano and a double-headed eagle. (Laughter.)

Mr. Dennys—And you replied—"Never mind what your opinion is I am going to sue you unless you settle the matter?"

Witness—Yes. On the 30th December Mr. Dennys made an offer of \$35 on account of costs, and on the 4th January it was agreed that Mr. Bornemann should pay \$100 as costs, but in consequence of Mr. Grossmann having made additional alterations in the agreement between the parties the costs were increased to \$184.

In cross-examination witness said his instructions were to get what costs he could from Bornemann. The defendant did not say he wanted all his costs paid.

The case was, at this point, adjourned.

THE POLICE SCANDAL.

INSPECTOR WITCHELL COMMITTED FOR TRIAL.

At the Police Court on Saturday, 27th inst. before Hon. H. E. Wodehouse, C.M.G., Job Witchell, Inspector in the Hongkong Police Force, was placed in the dock by Inspector Duncan on charges arising out of the police scandal.

Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C., appeared to prosecute on behalf of the Attorney-General, being instructed by Mr. H. L. Dennys (Crown Solicitor). The defendant was not represented by counsel.

The proceedings were opened in the following manner.

His Worship—Mr. Francis, have you any case?

Mr. Francis—Yes, sir. It is a charge, I am sorry to say, against Inspector Witchell for neglecting his duty as a police constable and accepting bribes.

His Worship—Do you appear to prosecute?

Mr. Francis—I appear here for the Attorney-General and am instructed by the Crown Solicitor.

His Worship—Do you wish me to hear the charge at once?

Mr. Francis—I shall be very glad if you can hear it at once.

His Worship (to the Captain Superintendent of Police, who was sitting at the table next to Mr. Francis)—Mr. May, I see you here. Are you watching the case?

Mr. May—I am watching the case.

His Worship—Will you take a seat up here?

Mr. Francis—I think it will be better for the present if he does not.

His Worship—Very well, then.

Mr. Francis, in opening the case, said—The charges in this case are laid against Mr. Witchell. They are:—

(1) That he, being an Inspector of Police in and for the colony of Hongkong, did, at Victoria, in the said colony, on the 7th March, 1897, and on divers dates thereafter, unlawfully and in breach of his duty as such Inspector as afore said, neglect to report to the Captain Superintendent of Police the existence of unlawful gambling houses in Wa Lane and Cheung Hing Lane, Victoria, aforesaid.

(2) That he, being an Inspector of Police in and for the colony of Hongkong, did at Victoria in the said colony, on the 11th March, 1897, and on divers days thereafter, unlawfully, willfully, and corruptly accept divers sums of money from the keepers or managers of sundry unlawful gambling houses in Victoria aforesaid to refrain from reporting to the Captain Superintendent of Police the existence of such gambling houses and to protect the said gambling houses.

Both the offences are offences at common law and not under any Ordinance or any Act of Parliament. In respect of the first offence I would refer your Worship to "Archbold's Criminal Pleadings," page 892 of the 19th edition, from which it appears that any neglect of duty by an officer of justice is a misdemeanour and punishable as such. With reference to the second charge I would refer your Worship to "Russell on Crimes," 16th chapter, where the offence of bribery is fully defined. The facts in the case are very simple. First, there will be no difficulty in proving that the Inspector is a constable enrolled under the provisions of the Hongkong Police Ordinance, that he holds the position of Inspector of Police, and that it is a general duty imposed on all constables by the Police rules and regulations, published with the authority of the Government under the Ordinance, that constables are to report if they have reason to suspect the existence of public gaming houses. Now the case, so far as it is known to the Crown, amounts to this: The colony is divided for certain purposes, especially in connection with this gambling business, into a certain number of sections. A special officer is in charge of each section with the special duty of restraining and putting down all public gambling within that section. Now it would appear that gambling was going on in the section Queen's Road and Jervois Street, over which Inspector Witchell was presiding at the early part of the year. Certain complaints were forwarded to the Captain Superintendent of Police and attention was directed to this district with the result that certain active measures were taken and gambling was put an end to for the time being in respect to this district. It would appear also that, before these gambling houses in this district were put down, Inspector Witchell had been deriving a considerable profit—something in the shape of \$7 a day—from the gambling houses within his district and that when the gambling houses were closed he lost this income. He then took steps, knowing the existence of gambling in some neighbouring district for which he was not responsible, and suffering apparently from this loss of income, to send communications to the owners or managers of gambling houses in the adjoining district saying that he was aware of the existence of these gambling houses and although they were not in his district he could take effective steps to have these gambling houses closed, and asking them if they could not make him certain allowances or payments. As the result a payment was made to him for a period of three months of at least \$1 a day, or \$30 a month. I think we shall be able to prove that the payment was continued for three months, if not for a longer period. Therefore, the first offence with which he is charged is that it having come to his knowledge that gambling

was going on anywhere in Hongkong, whether in his district or not, he failed to report it; secondly, that he accepted money from the keepers or managers of the gambling houses and failed to take steps to put down the houses as his duty required of him.

Defendant (pointing to a man in court who was in the custody of Acting Chief Inspector Mackie)—I beg to draw your Worship's attention to that witness who, I presume, is going to give evidence against me. He was sitting in court during the whole time the learned counsel was making a statement and has heard every word.

His Worship—Is he a witness?

Mr. Francis—Yes.

Defendant—He was removed from gaol under somebody's direction in charge of Inspector Mackie.

His Worship was understood to say that if the man was a witness he ought not to have been in court.

The man was thereupon removed from the court.

Evidence was then called.

Hon. Francis Henry May said—I am Captain Superintendent of Police. The defendant is duly enrolled as a member of the Hongkong Police Force. He has been an Inspector of Police for the last two years. He has had charge of what is known as No. 1 section of the Central District. The section extends from the Central Market to the Kowshing Theatre and all the section of the town between Queen's Road and the Praya within those limits. His special duties in that section were to suppress illegal gambling. I produce a copy of the Police regulations. Rule 73 reads—"Constables are to report if they have reason to suspect the existence of a public gaming house, but they are on no account themselves to go in nor suffer anyone else in for the purpose of obtaining proof." That rule is in force and binding now. There is a lane called Kwai Wa Lane in No. 1 section. At the end of last year, I returned from leave on the 7th October, and between that date and the end of November I received a large number of communications complaining of gambling in Kwai Wa Lane. None of those communications were received by me from the defendant.

Defendant here asked Counsel to repeat his last question, which was done.

Witness—I should like to alter that statement. I think the Inspector did apply for one or two warrants. I would not be sure if the information of the gambling was supplied to him by me. I rather think it was.

Mr. Francis—His application for these warrants was after you received the communications and after you had complained to him?

Witness—I would not swear to that, but I am positive that after my return to the colony the first intimation I had of the existence of gambling in Kwai Wa Lane was received from other sources than the Inspector. I issued four warrants in all.

Were there any captures?—The Inspector himself made at least one capture on a warrant. I think there were two convictions within that period and small fines were inflicted.

What was the result of the proceedings, so far as you know, in reference to Kwai Wa Lane?—The result was that I have received no further complaints this year.

Did you yourself sometime go?—Defendant—Will your Worship allow me the indulgence of pen and paper?

His Worship—Certainly. Mr. Francis—I do not know what the practice of the court is, but as this is a misdemeanour perhaps the defendant would like to sit at the table.

His Worship—I have no objection if it will facilitate the defendant taking notes.

The defendant—Thank you, your Worship. The defendant then took a seat at the head of the table and took notes of the evidence.

Mr. Francis (to witness): You, yourself, have, I think, effected a rather important capture in connection with gambling?

Witness—Yes. In what house and where was that?—No. Wa Lane—no, I beg your pardon, it was East Street.

Among the property seized there did you find an almost complete set of accounts?

books of some gambling syndicate or confraternity?—Yes.

On what date did you effect that seizure?—On the 21st June.

Has anyone been arrested and convicted in connection with that seizure?—There have been two Chinese detectives arrested under banishment warrants.

No, I am speaking in direct connection with the master of the gambling house was arrested and convicted.

What is his name?—Sam Yeen.

Are those account books in your possession?—They are.

Have they been in your possession and under your entire control ever since they were seized by you?—They have.

What was the defendant's number in the Police Force before he became an Inspector?—No. 12.

How are the Inspectors ordinarily designated amongst the Chinese?—By their numbers before they become Inspectors.

How is the defendant known and spoken of amongst the Chinese?—As No. 12.

Mr. Francis intimated that those were all the questions he had to ask.

Witness's evidence was then read over. On the Magistrate coming to the part referring to the receipt of information witness, in answer to the defendant, said—I said I would not swear that I received any information from the Inspector. My first information after my return to the colony was, I am quite certain, received from outside sources and not from the Inspector. To the best of my recollection I had no communication from the Inspector until after I had spoken to him on the subject.

Mr. Francis—After you received outside communications the Inspector did make an application?

Witness—He applied for two warrants.

You cannot be positive whether he made application for those two warrants before or after you had spoken to him on the subject?—Yes. I mean to say that I cannot be certain if the information which led him to apply for those warrants was information independent of me.

Although an Inspector is in charge for gambling purposes of a particular section does that relieve him from his duty under rule 73 of reporting any gambling that may come to his knowledge or that he may suspect to exist?—No; it is the duty of every constable to report gambling if he suspects it to exist.

His Worship—Mr. Witchell, would you like to ask the witness any question?

Defendant—Yes, Sir. (To witness)—How long have I been in charge of No. 1 gambling section?

Witness—You have been in charge of it since I returned from leave.

Since or before you returned from leave?—I do not know of my own knowledge, but I believe you were placed in charge of that section some months before my arrival in the colony—about August.

Do you remember what Inspector was in charge of No. 1 district before I relieved him?—I was not here.

Do you remember Inspector Hennessey being transferred to West Point?—I was not here. I was away seventeen months from the colony.

Will you kindly produce the police memo book of the transfer of Inspector Hennessey from No. 7 Police Station.—It can be produced.

Witness sent for the transfer book and upon it being produced he said—I find on reference to the transfer book that Inspector Hennessey was transferred to the Western district on the 6th August, 1896, from the Central.

Do you remember asking me where I obtained my information with regard to Kwai Wa Lane gambling?—I do not remember; it is possible I may have done so.

Can you say how many days or weeks it was after you returned to the colony.—No, I cannot.

Did any other Inspector obtain a warrant or raid Kwai Wa Lane by your instructions?—Yes, Inspector Kemp did.

On that date do you remember what particular duty I was on?—I cannot remember.

Do you remember the result of that raid?—The result of Inspector Kemp's raid was that nothing was found.

You remember the morning that he raided this house?—I do not remember.

On what information was the warrant obtained?—I cannot be sure on what particular information.

Was it a letter addressed to you regarding gambling?—It is possible it might have been. My recollection is that the principal information I had regarding gambling from that lane was from outside sources.

Mr. Francis—Letters received?

Witness—Yes.

Defendant—Are you sure there were only four warrants taken out for Kwai Wa Lane altogether?

Witness—Yes, I am quite sure.

You said only small fines were inflicted?—Yes.

Defendant—Of course, your Worship knows that the Police have nothing to do with penalties imposed. That all lies with the Magistrate.

His Worship—Decidedly.

Defendant—Have you since had any complaints from my district regarding public gaming?

Witness—No.

His Worship—Since when?

Defendant—Since gambling was stopped in Kwai Wa Lane.

Witness—What sort of complaints do you mean?

Mr. Francis—Official or unofficial?

Defendant—Unofficial.

Witness—No.

Defendant—Can you tell me the number of warrants and convictions I have obtained since your return to the colony?—I could not say at the moment. I know you have reported a house in Jubilee Street, No. 14, and you have reported a house in Hillier Street. That was up to the time of the Wa Lane seizure—the East Street seizure, I should say.

Have warrants been obtained against these houses?—I know that the Jubilee Street warrant was obtained but not executed.

I think you are mistaken in the street. That was No. 5, Morrison Street?—14, Jubilee Street. I am speaking of the time before the East Street raid.

Did you get information about the Jubilee Street house before the raid?—I got it from yourself.

How long since?—Early in the year; about February.

Not the same number?—It may have been 12 or 14; it was a house in Jubilee Street.

The warrant was executed, but nothing was found?—It may have been executed, but nothing was found.

I think you have notes of warrants applied for by Inspectors?—Yes, I have a register.

The register was produced and witness read as follows:—In Jubilee Street this year, Nos. 12 and 13. The information was given by Inspector Quincey to Inspector Witchell and communicated to me by Inspector Witchell. A warrant was taken out on 14th January and was executed, and there was no gambling reported. 14, Jubilee Street, on 16th July; information given by Inspector Witchell. Seventeen persons were arrested; first and second defendants were fined \$100, and the rest \$10 each. Morrison Street, No. 5, on 8th January. Inspector Witchell applied for warrant. Sixteen men were arrested. On the 24th January a warrant was applied for by Inspector Witchell for Nos. 3 and 5, Morrison Street. There was an arrest, but I have not made a note of the result.

Were any others applied for? Bonham Strand, for instance?—Bonham Strand was about seven months ago. It does not appear here; the omission may be an oversight.

Were there any in Queen's Road or Tong Lane?—Yes, on the 31st October, last year, at No. 89, Queen's Road West on the defendant's information. I should say, in examination, that of course I will not swear that the defendant owed his information to his own sources.

His Worship—In the cases you have mentioned?—In the other cases the information was furnished by the Inspector.

To which are you referring, then?—I refer to the one in Queen's Road West. Two men were arrested; no gambling gear. 3rd November, last year, 57, Queen's Road West; six men and fan-tan gear arrested. On 8th December, Queen's Road West; seven men and gear. No. 85, Queen's Road West, on 21st May,

and 89 on the same date; four men and gear in each case. No. 57 again on 14th May, four men and gear; 85, same date, five men arrested and gambling gear. Nos. 59 and 87, Queen's Road West on the 6th July; five men and gear arrested. In all these cases I have it down that they were reported by Inspector Witchell. I received various complaints about these houses—coolies gambling on the roof and so forth.

Defendant—Do you remember at any time telling me not to trouble about coolie houses?—I remember in connection with that house you reported to me in Jubilee Street.

The Magistrate—Telling him what—not to trouble about coolie houses?

Witness—No, your Worship, I said I wanted to catch some of the long-coated gentlemen and not coolies. I meant that I wanted a decent seizure and not a lot of coolies.

His Worship—Quite so; not coolies as in nearly all these cases.

Witness—I am not particularly referring to his cases but to the majority of gambling cases.

Defendant—Can you say whether the masters were fined and convicted in connection with those warrants which were executed?—No, I cannot say.

Defendant—You have visited Kwai Wa Lane, I presume?—I have been in Kwai Wa Lane.

Is there anything particular about these houses which would attract your attention to them as being gambling houses?—No, I do not think so, but if gambling was going on in them there would probably be evidence of it. There is nothing in the houses *per se* to attract your attention, but if gambling was being conducted there would be evidence of it.

You know what happens when a European in plain clothes or uniform goes near these places?—Yes.

Do they leave any signs of gambling going on then?—My opinion is that if gambling is going on in a house on any considerable scale a police officer who knows what he is about—he may not notice it the first day—would notice something odd about that house and that street.

By the rules and regulations no police officer is allowed to enter a house or to send anyone into a house to ascertain if public gambling is going on?—No.

You say you raided No. 3, East Street and found a quantity of gambling accounts?—Yes.

Was there anything in these gambling accounts referring to Kwai Wa Lane?—No.

What accounts, if any, refer to me?—There are accounts in the books.

What entries?—To the effect that money at the rate of \$1 a day was paid to you.

Will you kindly produce that book?

Witness—Your Worship, I prefer not to produce that book.

Mr. Francis—I think, Mr. May, the book must be produced, and I would ask your Worship to direct that the entries be covered up and sealed except those relating to the defendant.

Defendant—Your Worship, I think that is not correct. Any entries there which might be taken as referring to me might refer to other people. I think the entries should be read now in court so that there shall be a proper and just inquiry into it.

Witness—Do you wish me to produce the book?

Defendant—Yes. I demand that the book be put in, your Worship.

Witness then left the box and fetched the book from his office. He produced it in court.

The Magistrate—That is the book?

Witness—Yes.

It is the book which has been asked for?—Yes.

Defendant—Is that the book which refers to money stated to have been received by me?—Yes. Is that the only book?—That is the only book that refers to you particularly.

Defendant—I should like to see the entry, your Worship.

His Worship—Certainly.

Mr. Francis—The entries can be translated and read.

Defendant—I am entitled to see the entries. The Magistrate (to witness)—Will you mark

the particular entries in that book referring to the defendant?

Witness—One entry is merely a repetition of the other.

Mr. Francis—How many entries are there altogether?—I know there are two. The first entry is "No. 12, \$1.10."

Defendant—Your Worship, is Mr. May a legal translator?

His Worship—He is on his oath.

Witness (continuing)—"Paid to Cheng On." No. 2 entry is—"No. 12, \$1 paid to Cheng On." Three characters representing "Paid to Cheng On" are struck out. They are not illegible but simply crossed out, and underneath is put "Entered in Kum's account."

Mr. Francis—Are there any other characters in the book in any way referring to the defendant except those two?—No.

Are there any entries in the book which alter or modify the effect of those entries?—No.

Is it important for the administration of justice that the other entries in the book should not be disclosed?—It is most essential.

His Worship—These questions are being put on the demand made by the defendant that he should see the book in its entirety?

Mr. Francis—Yes. My application is that the other entries, which do not affect the defendant in any way, shall be covered up in such a way that neither he nor anyone else will have an opportunity of seeing what they are. Mr. May has sworn that it is essential for the administration of justice that those entries should not be seen, and I shall ask your Worship, after the book has been marked and the particular entries translated, to order it to remain in Mr. May's custody.

His Worship—The witness has stated that there are no other entries that refer directly or indirectly to the defendant, that there are no entries which in any way affect his position, and that it is most essential in the interests of justice that the book should not be—

Defendant—Your Worship, it appears to me that this book has been tampered with already by the admission of the Captain Superintendent of Police himself in court. He says the entry "Paid to Cheng On" has been erased and another substituted.

Mr. Francis (to witness)—Was that erasure made when you seized the book?

Witness—Yes.

Defendant—The book will be put in?

His Worship—Yes, and you can see the entries, but as a very good reason has been given why the whole of the entries should not be put in I am inclined to limit—

Defendant—Your Worship, there is more than one No. 12 in Hongkong.

His Worship—Certainly. I am not going into the question as to how the entries affect you. What the prosecution rely upon, so far as this book is concerned, are those two entries. I limit the production of the book to the two entries the Captain Superintendent of Police has read out, and I will take any steps that are wanted to keep the book undisclosed.

Mr. Francis—I ask your Worship for these translations to be made by Mr. Brewin, who is a sworn translator, and not by any other translator.

The Magistrate—I have no objection to that.

Witness—I understand, your Worship, that you will return this book to my custody.

His Worship—I shall return the book to your custody. Only these two entries are in the custody of the Court and they will remain so. I shall hand the book over to the constable in charge of the case.

His Worship and Mr. Francis here had a private consultation at the request of his Worship.

Defendant—Are these two entries you have found in your seizure at No. 3, East Street the whole of the entries in connection with me?

Witness—Yes.

The first entry is \$1.10 and the second one, \$1?—Yes.

And entered in Kum's account?—Yes.

Are you quite sure I am known to the Chinese as No. 12?—Yes.

Could you state what days intervened between the warrants that were obtained for Kwai Wa Lane?—29th October, 4th November, 10th November, and 24th November.

Each gambling district is defined and one Inspector put in charge of each district?—Yes.

Is an Inspector allowed by the rules of the Force to take out a warrant in another Inspector's district?—He is not allowed to take out a warrant at all without permission.

Is there an order prohibiting an Inspector taking out a warrant in another Inspector's district?—There is no such order.

Are you quite sure?—To the best of my knowledge no such order has been issued by me and I do not remember reading such an order. I will read my order relating to gambling. "Gambling in the Central District. Inspector Witchell will take charge from Central Market to Kowshing Theatre below Queen's Road Central. Inspector so and so takes charge of No. 2 section. Inspector so and so takes charge of No. 3 section, etc. Inspector Stanton will assist the above Inspectors in the suppression of gambling." That order is dated 12th May, 1893. That was three months after I took charge of the Force. That order has remained in force since.

I think in the Police regulations you will find that no Inspector is allowed to take out a gambling warrant except in his own district?—There is no reference in the Police regulations to these gambling districts. That order is a departmental arrangement made by myself.

Then there is not an order to the effect that no Inspector is allowed to take out a warrant in another Inspector's district?—Not to my knowledge.

Regarding No. 2, Wa Lane, have you visited that house?—No.

You have not seen the house?—I have seen the house, but I have not been inside.

Can you describe the entrance to it—where the entrance is?—I am not sure how the lane is numbered. I think it is at the Lower Lascar Row end.

My reason for asking this is that I understand a charge was brought against the master for gambling at No. 2, Wa Lane.—My answer is I am not quite sure at which end of the lane the entrance is, whether it is at the Hollywood Road end or the Lascar Row end. I rather think it is at the Hollywood Road end. There is nothing particular about the entrance.

You say \$1 a day has been paid?—Yes.

But is there only one entry of that amount being paid.

Mr. Francis—That is a matter for argument and not a question.

This concluded the cross-examination of the witness.

The witness's evidence was then read over to him. The notes of His Worship made the witness say that the other entries in the book did not refer directly or indirectly to the defendant.

Witness—I did not say "indirectly."

His Worship—I am inclined to think you said it.

Witness—Well, it is not material.

After the whole of the evidence had been read witness said he wished the word "indirectly" struck out.

Defendant—Then how about the other entries? The witness suggested before that they did not apply directly or indirectly; now it is altered to directly.

His Worship—I think you are entitled to further question the witness on that point.

Mr. Francis—The next statement of the witness, I think, gets over the apparent difficulty; it completely covers the same point. He said "These are the only entries I find that relate to him in particular."

Witness—To the best of my knowledge and belief I did not say "indirectly." If your Worship thinks you can trust your memory so far I will leave the word in.

His Worship—My memory consists of taking the words down as they were spoken.

Mr. Francis—The probability is that I put the question in that form.

Witness—I am prepared to say there is nothing in the list except those two entries that could implicate the Inspector in any way.

Defendant—Do those two entries refer to a daily account?

Witness—They do.

What is there in that book that causes you to think it refers to a daily account?—I know from my examination of other account books that it is a daily account.

Defendant—I should like those other account books put in. Can that be done?

Mr. Francis—Is there anything in that book that has been put in, beyond these two entries, that shows they are periodical payments, or do they simply appear as two entries without date or any indication of how, when, or where they were made?

Witness—In this book—

There are simply two entries?—Yes.

As payments?—In this book there are simply these two entries.

Defendant—That does not refer to any other book?—No; it refers to no other book.

And no other books refer to that?—No.

His Worship—Are you able to let me see those other account books?

Witness—I say there is nothing in those other account books which directly refers to this account book.

Mr. Francis—You mean to say you have inferred from what you have seen that they are daily payments. You do not know as a fact?

Witness—I infer that.

What you have done is to state as a fact that you know they relate to a daily account. "I know this from the other account books."—Yes.

His Worship—I think the defendant ought to see those other account books.

Witness—I see no objection as long as the books are returned to my custody.

Are you able to produce the books that led you to that inference?—I can produce them.

Witness then went to his office and after an absence of a few minutes he returned and said—"I find, your Worship, that the production of any other book will not carry my evidence any further as to that being a daily account. I say that to the best of my knowledge and belief it is a daily account."

His Worship—You do not know it from an examination of the other account books?—I say to the best of my knowledge and belief it is a daily account, but I will not swear it is a daily account.

Defendant—From what facts have you derived that opinion?

Mr. Francis—I do not think, your Worship, that is a question the defendant is entitled to ask. I am afraid that later he will have information on that point.

His Worship—I think the defendant is entitled to ask from what sources the witness derived his opinion.

Defendant—I do not wish to press the question.

His Worship—As the case proceeds you will understand more, probably.

Defendant—How long after your arrival in the colony did you receive information about the gambling houses in Wa Lane?

Witness—Immediately after my arrival.

Did that information say how long gambling had been carried on there?—I do not think so.

On what date were those entries made in the book?—They are not dated.

To the best of your knowledge when did gambling cease in Kwai Wa Lane. How long after your arrival in the colony?—Gambling ceased during the remainder of the month of October. Then it began again. To the best of my knowledge and belief it went on until I raided the place.

I am speaking about Kwai Wa Lane.—All I can say about Kwai Wa Lane is that after the end of November I received no more complaints about gambling in that lane.

Mr. Francis—I have one question, your Worship. Does Rule 73 apply to the Inspector whom you have put in charge of these different sections for the purpose of suppressing gambling? Have they a right to send a man into a house for the purpose of finding out if gambling is going on?—Yes. The rule does not apply to those Inspectors.

Each Inspector has a complete right to take whatever steps he thinks necessary to suppress gambling in his district?—That is so.

His Worship—Has that been the practice in the Police Force?—The prohibition against entering these gambling houses applies to constables only.

That has been the practice?—Yes.

Defendant—That is how you construe the regulation. Will you kindly look at it from a common sense point of view.

His Worship here read the regulation.

Defendant—That rule affects the whole Force, from the Captain Superintendent downwards.

Witness—An Inspector of Police constantly sends an informer into a gambling house to obtain information; otherwise he would not get a conviction.

Is there an order prohibiting Inspectors employing informers or sending constables into these gambling houses, and have there not been prosecutions in which Inspectors have entered these houses and people have been killed and the Inspectors charged with manslaughter at the Supreme Court?—I do not know of any such order prohibiting Inspectors employing informers. With regard to the last part—

His Worship—That is all.

Witness—There is a second question.

His Worship—No, there is no second question. Sign the depositions, please.

Cheng On, who was brought up in the custody of Acting Chief Inspector Mackie, was the next witness. He said—

I am Chinese an Excise Officer in the employ of the Opium Farm. I have been in that employ thirteen months. Before that I was a detective in the Hongkong Police Force. I am acquainted with all or nearly all the Inspectors, and as Excise Officer I was frequently up at the Police Court. I know defendant, Inspector Witchell. He is known as "No. 12" amongst the Chinese. I have paid him money. Sometimes if he was not at home I paid his wife. From the 14th of March to the 17th of June I have paid him \$12.60 every week, each Monday. I got that money from Tung Kum. I always got this money from Tung Kum, who is the keeper of the Yee Yuen mercer's shop, Hollywood Road. Before the first payment was made by me to the defendant, on 11th March, he invited me to his room. I went with him and conversed with him in the Inspector's quarters. Mrs. Witchell was present; she was going in and out of the room. I was speaking half in Chinese and half in English. Defendant speaks Chinese. This conversation had reference to the money payments afterwards made. He said, "In going round on my duty I saw a lot of people standing at the entrance to Chung Hing Lane and Wa Lane. Then I used my stick to drive them away. Then a Chinese abused me, and said 'No. 12' is proud. Then I ran after a Chinaman. That Chinaman ran up to the first floor and called me to come upstairs, waving his hand. As I had no warrant I dared not go upstairs. He wanted to disgrace me. I went away and a lot of people jeered at me. I do not know who taught the Chinese to treat me in this way. They think I cannot arrest them, but I can arrest them. If I arrest them, Mr. May will be very pleased with it. I have known these gambling houses for a long time. I know that some of my foks received some money to spend, therefore I do not wish to arrest them. If I go to arrest them it will spoil the business of my foks, which is a very foolish act to do. I do not wish to do such an act; I do not know why the Chinese treat me in this way. In my section I know a house was open for two days, and the people have petitioned to Mr. May." I asked him, "Who told you all this thing you have told me?" He said, "An old man, Sang Yung, between fifty and sixty years of age." I told him not to have any conversation with that man now; he is not a proper man and he does not know how to speak. On one occasion there was gambling going on in Kwai Wa Lane, and defendant said—"I do not know which — took Mr. May up to a house in Jervois Street to look into the second floor of a house in Kwai Wa Lane where the gambling was going on. After looking at the place Mr. May came back to the office and sent some one to call me. Then Mr. May said to me, 'There is gambling in your place.' I replied to Mr. May, 'Sometimes.' Mr. May answered, 'Gambling going on just now.' Then Mr. May said 'Take out a paper at once to arrest.' He told me all this news. Then defendant asked me if I knew the 'fat child.' I said 'Yes, I know him.' He said, 'When I go round on my duty this man follows me and wants to speak to me. As there were a lot of people in the street I did not wish to speak to him.' Witness asked Inspector Witchell, 'How do you know him?' 'I know him,' he replied, 'because he is the master in Chung Hing Street.' Then Inspector Witchell said, 'I do not know why the man wanted to speak to me. I think he

wants to speak to me about gambling in Kwai Wa Lane." I said, "If the man were to offer you anything, don't promise him." He said, "Mr. May has great power, because he had arrested once before." I said "That place cannot be kept as a gambling house."

Mr. Francis—Tell me what he said about money.

Defendant—Your Worship, will you direct the witness to tell the story in his own way?

Mr. Francis—I am entitled to examine the witness as I like.

His Worship—I think Mr. Francis's question must be put.

Witness (continuing)—The defendant said "I receive not a cash from this place." Then defendant asked me, "Do you know those gambling people?" I said, "I do." The defendant said, "I have a lot of children and the expenses are large. My money is not sufficient. Will you kindly go and see those persons to get some expenses for me." I said, "I am afraid that the people might refuse because they are not in your section." Defendant said, "If they are in my section I won't let them keep open. As they belong to another person's section, I am not afraid. As people are eating flesh I want you to pick up some bone; I shall be obliged if you will ask these persons for me." I went and saw Tung Kum, and A Yeen or Sam Yeen. I had a conversation with Inspector Witchell about Sam Yeen. In consequence of that conversation with the Inspector, I told all I had heard to Tung Kum, who told Sam Yeen. I was there when he told Sam Yeen. Sam Yeen replied, "Very little." I said, "How much." He said, "\$1 a day."

The Magistrate—Is this evidence, Mr. Francis?

Mr. Francis—Yes, your Worship, I think so. He is the authorised agent of the defendant.

Defendant—I object to that remark; it is nothing but humbug from beginning to end.

Witness (continuing)—I told defendant what sum had been mentioned. Defendant said, "Masker." I further told him people want 10 cents for labour; I was referring to Tung Kum. I was not referring to myself. Then defendant said, "All right, I am satisfied; I will pay him ten cents labour." Then I said to Mr. Witchell, "If a man is willing to give, are you willing to receive? It is not my affair." The Inspector said, "I receive." In accordance with that arrangement, I received \$12.60 a week from Tung Kum. I took the money every Monday and paid it sometimes to the defendant and sometimes to his wife if he was not there. The \$12.60 was from two gambling houses—one at Chung Hing Street and Wa Lane—\$1 from each house a day and ten cents off for labour. I would know Sam Yeen again if I saw him.

Sam Yeen, the master of the house in Wa Lane which was raided was here brought into court in custody and witness identified him.

This concluded the witness's examination and it was decided to take Mr. Brewin's evidence before the cross-examination was proceeded with.

Mr. A. W. Brewin, Acting Inspector of Government Schools, said—I have knowledge of Chinese, both of the spoken language and the character. No. 1 entry in the book is, "No. 12, \$1.10; handed to Cheng On." Entry No. 2 reads, "No. 12, \$1;" then there are characters signifying, "Handed to Cheng On." These are crossed out. Then there are the characters, "Handed to Tang." I am not certain of the last character; it is abbreviated.

Cross-examined—The characters, "Handed a Cheng On," have been crossed out; there is to round mark over them.

Re-examined—I do not know whether the Chinese book-keepers or accountants make use of that mark over an entry in a day book to show that the account has been transferred to another book.

Defendant—Your Worship, I see that the Chinese witness has been taken away.

His Worship—Who has taken him away?

Defendant—Inspector Mackie.

Mr. Francis—The witness has no right to leave the court.

Defendant—The prosecution have got him in their hands to do what they like with him.

His Worship—I will see that you have a fair trial.

The adjournment for luncheon was then taken. Defendant asked to be allowed out at liberty. He had been locked up since four o'clock the previous afternoon.

Mr. Francis intimated that there was no objection to the defendant being allowed bail. He could insist upon bail if he liked.

His Worship asked the defendant to get bail during the adjournment.

The Captain Superintendent of Police intimated that he would make arrangements for the defendant to be at liberty during the adjournment.

After the adjournment the defendant cross-examined the witness Cheng On.

Defendant—Are you at present an Excise Officer for the Opium Farmer?

Witness—Yes.

Have you been arrested under a banishment warrant?—I do not know.

Have you been detained in the goal?—Yes.

Since you have been in gaol you have been brought before the Captain Superintendent?—Only once.

Who was present at the time?—Mr. Dennys, the solicitor.

No one else?—No.

Is that where you made the statement you made to the court this morning?—Yes.

You say you remember coming to my quarters on the 14th March last?—On the 11th March.

Was that the first time you had been there?—That was not the first occasion.

On what date did you go there before?—I do not remember. I went there last year.

What did you go there for last year?—I went to see you about a case in which Pang On made a false charge against three of my clansmen.

What did you have to say about that?—You told me you knew it was a false case and you said you would speak straightforwardly.

In what month was that?—Between the 7th October and the 4th December.

Had you been to my house, or did my wife and I meet you in the street a few days previous to the 11th?—I do not remember.

Do you remember going to my quarters on the 9th?—I do not remember.

You seem to be very forgetful just now. Do you remember meeting me and my wife on the afternoon of the 9th at the corner of Wellington Street and Lyndhurst Terrace?—I did not meet you and your wife.

Was anything said to you in the street on that occasion about getting some samples of silk?—It was not in March; it was in the 4th moon—May, when something was said to me about silk.

Did you come to my house on the 11th March?—I did.

Whom did you see?—You and your wife were there and the children were running about.

Was anyone else there?—A cook. There was no one else.

Where did you sit down?—Near the fireplace in the room next to the dining room.

Which way did you come in? By the back, up the steps.

You are quite sure you did not see anyone else there?—I did not see anyone else.

Did you bring any pieces of silk on the 11th?—I did not.

I mean samples, not pieces.—No; it was in May that I took some samples.

You did not show any samples to anyone on the 11th March?—You had not mentioned about buying things then.

When did you go again after the 11th?—On the 13th March, between 2 and 3 p.m.

Who asked you into the sitting room on the 11th?—You were in the sitting room and you asked me to come in.

Was anyone else there besides myself?—Your wife came in afterwards.

You are sure I was in the sitting room when you came?—Yes.

I was not upstairs?—No.

I was not called downstairs?—No.

Be quite sure. There was no one else in the room besides myself, my wife, the children, and the cook?—The children and the cook were not in the room.

But there was no one else there?—No.

Did I say anything to you on the 9th March about a friend going home to England and that I wanted to send some silk with him?—No.

Did I tell you the Clerk of the Gaol—Mr. Watson—was going home to England?—No.

I did not say anything to you about Mr. Watson?—I don't remember that you did. You did not meet me in Lyndhurst Terrace on the 9th March.

And you never got any samples of silk at the end of November or the beginning of December last year for me?—No.

Did I show you a photograph on the piano of a lady to whom I was going to send the silk—the photograph you dropped on the floor?—Yes, I remember that and also dropping it on the floor.

Was that at the end of November or beginning of December?—It was this year and not last.

Did you ask me if the lady was my mother?—No.

Did I show you a photograph of a gentleman?—No.

Did I tell you that gentleman was Mr. Falconer, Magistrate at Lorne, South Wales?—No.

Did I tell you it was his lady?—No.

Did you remark "It's very handsome?"—I said it was pretty good.

On the 11th, when you went in, who met you in the passage way?—I walked along the passage and when I got to the room you said, "Come in."

It was rather familiar for you to come in like that?—I went to look for you.

Did you ask where I was?—There was no one in the house when I went there and so I did not ask.

What are you talking about?—I walked up to your room and saw your there.

How long do you say you stayed there on the 11th?—Three quarters of an hour.

Didn't Mrs. Witchell tell you to sit down and she would call me?—She was upstairs; she came down afterwards.

She was not in the room?—No.

You said we were all there. Did you say to Mrs. Witchell on the 11th, when she said she would call me, "Oh, never mind, I've brought that piece of silk pay you look see?"—No.

Did Mrs. Witchell say that was not the kind of silk she wanted?—No.

You went out at the back, didn't you?—Yes.

Did anyone call to you as you were going out?—No.

Did I come on to the verandah and ask you if you had the silk?—No.

Did you take the silk away?—It was not at that time.

Did another lady tell you she would like samples of silk at that time?—No.

You did not leave any samples there?—No.

Just think.—I did leave some silk, but not then.

Why were you asked to get the samples of silk?—Your wife told me to bring them as she wanted to make a dress for a daughter.

After the 11th when did you come again?—Next night when I gave you the answer.

What answer?—That that man would give you \$1.

Are you sure it was not four days after the 11th that you came to my house?—No. I went either on the 12th or 13th March. It was on the 14th that you agreed to receive \$1 a day.

Where did you see me on that day?—In the dining room.

What day was it?—I do not remember.

When was the first Monday you paid me money?—On the 20th or 21st March. The payments commenced from the 14th March.

Have you been to my house respecting cases?—Last year.

Do you remember coming to my house at the end of last month or beginning of this and asking me to arrest a man who had brought some girls from Canton?—Yes.

To whom did I refer you?—I told you Inspector Stanton knew all about it.

Did I tell you to apply to the Magistrate for a warrant?—Yes.

Do you remember what night that was?—28th June.

Did I direct you to the Captain Superintendent of Police?—No.

Did I tell you I would take you to him on the following morning?—No.

Did you come to the station next morning?—I was told to bring a woman to the station two days previous to the 28th June.

Do you remember the night Inspector Baker was suspended from duty?—I do not know.

Did you come to my house?—You sent a child for me, but I was not in the house. When I got home my wife told me that No. 12 Inspec. or had called, and I saw you the following morning. I went because I was sent for. You said to me, "Do you know that Mr. May has seized a lot of people's names?"

Did you ask me what was the matter with No. 10?—I did not, but in the course of the conversation you said that Inspector Baker was restless and frightened. I said, "Yes, because that house is in his section." Then you asked me, "Is my name there," and I replied, "I do not know." You said, "Do the people know my name?" I said, "They do not know your name, but they know you as No. 12."

Have you told that to the Captain Superintendent during the course of his investigations in the case?—No.

You went so far to tell Mr. May so much and this important thing you left out?—I was never asked about it.

Did you say anything about Inspector Stanton being transferred to Stanley?—No.

Did you say anything about No. 43 being banished to Shaokwan?—No.

Mr. Francis—Who is 43?

Defendant.—Sergeant Holt. (To witness), Didn't you say the matter was very serious?

Witness—Yes; you told me the matter was very important.

Did you ask me how you could see Inspector Stanton?—No.

Did I say, "What do you want to see Inspector Stanton for?"—No.

Was your answer, "The case belonging to the brothel in Hollywood Road is not over yet?"—No.

Did you say you had a share in that brothel and you would lose all your money?—No.

Did you go and see the Captain Superintendent of Police about the girls brought from Canton?—I did not.

When I questioned you did you say it was a friend and not you who was interested in the brothel?—I said it was a relative.

Have you seen me from that day until this morning?—I have not seen you from the day when you sent for me until this morning. The interview took place in the bedroom.

At this point the defendant noticed some men standing just outside the Court door and he asked whether any of the witnesses for the prosecution were there.

Acting Chief Inspector Mackie went outside and ordered a man who was a witness to be taken to the adjoining court. The Inspector explained to the Magistrate that the man had just been brought out of gaol by Inspector Kemp.

His Worship said all witnesses must be kept out of hearing.

The defendant said the man had been there ten minutes.

Mr. Francis said that was not correct, as it not ten minutes since the order was given for the man to be brought from the gaol.

The defendant replied that he had seen the man there since just before five minutes to four and it was now four o'clock.

In answer to further questions by the defendant witness said it was the 27th June when he had the conversation respecting Inspector Stanton. It was about the 11th June when the child was sent for him.

Mr. Francis pointed out that Inspector Stanton was not suspended until the 13th June, so the conversation on the 27th May could have had no connection with the suspension.

Witness, in answer to further questions, repeated the conversation he said he had with defendant. He did not mention the suspensions and say it was a very bad job for Inspectors Baker and Stanton.

Defendant—Regarding the time it was agreed for the money to be taken at the rate of \$1 per day, did anyone come with you on that day—the 11th March?

Witness—I went alone.

On any one occasion that you have been to my house have you had anyone with you?—On no occasion have I been with anybody.

Have you had anyone waiting outside the door for you on any occasion you have brought money to me or my wife?—No.

Have you ever had any money marked by any police officer and put into your possession to be handed to me?—No.

You are an old detective?—Yes. That is the usual course adopted when it is desirous to catch a person accepting bribes?—Yes.

That has never been done?—I had no intention to trap you.

Your action does not appear like that at present. You admit yourself to be an informer in this case?—I am not an informer. I have spoken justly as far as I know.

What did this money consist of that you allege you have paid to me or my wife?—Tung Kum gave me the money in subsidiary coins which I changed into notes.

So you lost by it?—I did not lose because I changed the money at a friend's house.

But you can get \$5.50 in subsidiary coins for a \$5 note from any money changer in Hong-kong?—It is not so much as that.

Can you get it in Canton?—I have never been there.

You say you were receiving nothing for your trouble and were doing it with a grateful heart—

Mr. Francis, interrupting, said the witness had not said he received nothing.

Defendant—How much did you receive as wages for collecting this \$2, as you allege, for me?

Witness—I received nothing. Tung Kum gave me \$1.80, because you told me to be kind enough to get the money for you, and it was my duty to get it, even if I was a loser.

What was the date you say the — took Mr. May to a gambling house in Jervois Street?—I do not remember. That was a statement of yours.

Do you know as a fact that Mr. May did go there?—I do not know; you told me.

What benefit should I derive from telling you a yarn like that?—Well, you are a friend of mine and you told me.

Told you a pack of lies? Did I say anything about my going to the gambling house?—You told me you went to make arrests.

It was now five o'clock and Mr. Francis suggested an adjournment.

Defendant said he had many more questions to ask the witness.

His Worship then conferred with Hon. J. H. Stewart Lockhart (Colonial Secretary), who was sitting on the bench, and then said that another Magistrate would be appointed while this case was proceeding.

It was then agreed to resume the hearing at 9 o'clock on Monday morning, the 19th inst.

Mr. Francis—With regard to the defendant—

His Worship—I think he is entitled to bail. Have you any remarks to make about the amount?

Mr. Francis—We leave it entirely in your Worship's hands.

Defendant—I have a wife and family and household goods and there is not much fear that I shall run away. I have nowhere to run to.

His Worship—You will have no difficulty in finding bail?

Defendant—I think I can find bail.

His Worship—Bail in one surety of \$500.

The Court then adjourned.

19th July.

When the case was called on defendant said—Your Worship, I am not a solicitor and I would ask your Worship to assist me in this case. There were a lot of leading questions asked and hearsay evidence produced on Saturday which should not have been allowed.

His Worship—Draw my attention to what you think is improper evidence.

Defendant—Perhaps you are better acquainted than I with that evidence.

His Worship—I am not aware of any improper evidence so far. I will watch the case to the best of my power.

Defendant—Thank you, your Worship.

The defendant then proceeded with his cross-examination of the witness Cheng On.

Defendant—How long were you in the Police Force?

Witness—Between 15 and 16 years.

In what branch of the Force were you?

When I joined the Force I was in the Water Police. In two years I was transferred to the Central Police Station, where I was for several months on charge room duty.

What did you do after that?—After that I was attached to the detective department.

Why did you leave the detective department?—I was told to find a witness. I could not find him and I was reported to Inspector Matheson for sending the witness to Canton.

You were reported for that?—Yes. I did not see the witness.

In what case was that witness concerned?—In a case in which a constable was accused of snatching dice.

And snatching anything else?—Fourteen cents.

Was that all?—And a dice cloth.

Why did you leave the Force?

His Worship—One moment. Who is in charge of this case now?

Inspector Duncan—I am, your Worship.

His Worship—Are any of those people outside the door witnesses?

Inspector Duncan—No, your Worship.

Defendant—There might be some witnesses there.

His Worship—I am told there are not; that is sufficient.

Defendant (to Witness)—Why did you leave the Force?

Witness—I was transferred to Yaumati and I resigned.

Did you resign on a pension?—Yes.

Have you a pension now?—No.

Why?—I took the whole lot at one time.

How much?—\$174 or \$176.

For 15 or 16 years' service?—Yes.

Was that all you were entitled to?—I do not know. The Captain Superintendent makes up the amount.

You do not know whether you were entitled to more or not?—In the first class I was entitled to more.

Why was your pension reduced?—I was in the second class.

Were you entitled to more in the second class?—I do not know.

Were you reported before you resigned?—While at Yaumati I was fined 50 cents at roll call.

Was that the reason why you sent in your resignation?—No. After 10 years' service I could resign when I liked.

When did you resign?—In 1892.

Did you have a character at your discharge?—Yes.

Can you produce it?—It is at my house.

What does that character say?—"Fair."

And you are quite sure you were not entitled to a bigger pension after 15 or 16 years' service?—One cannot calculate the pension at all. If a man is reported he is sure to get less pension.

If you had not been reported what would you have been entitled to?—I do not know.

You are not conversant with figures?—Yes. I know how to calculate.

Defendant here intimated that this concluded his cross-examination and witness's evidence was then read over.

His Worship also read over part of the witness's evidence and asked him to verify the dates, which he did.

In reference to the statement that the witness's wife told him the Inspector had sent for him, defendant submitted that such a statement was not admissible.

Mr. Francis—The answer was given in answer to defendant's questions. He must take the consequence of that.

The witness was then re-examined.

Mr. Francis—Mr. Witchell has asked you about some silk samples?

Witness—Yes.

From what shop did you get those samples?—Chu Lun, Jervois Street.

Did you buy silk for Mrs. Witchell or did you only get samples?—She asked me to bring some samples and I brought some.

Answer the question.—I did not buy any silk for Mrs. Witchell, but I brought some samples for her.

Can you fix on the day when she first spoke to you about any silk?—It was four or five days before Dr. Ayres went away—before he gave a tea party.

Have you got samples for Mrs. Witchell on more than one occasion?—On two occasions.

You have told us the one occasion; when was the other?—On the following day or the day after.

Did you get the two sets of samples from the same shop?—Yes.

This concluded the witness's evidence, and he was, on the application of the defendant, detained in court.

Sam Yeen, who said he had no other name, was then called. In answer to Mr. Francis he said—I am now a prisoner in Victoria Gaol. I was convicted the other day of keeping a gambling house in Wa Lane. The sentence was nine months' imprisonment and a fine of \$1,000. Before I was arrested I resided at 3, East Street. I was in charge of the accounts at the gambling house. I know Cheng On, whom I now recognise.

Mr. Francis—Have you ever paid him any money?

Witness—He came to me and spoke to me about giving \$1.10 to "No. 12" and I asked him to whom I should hand the money and he said, "To Tung Kum."

Do you remember when it was he asked you for money for "No. 12"?—About the second or third moon this year.

Can you get nearer to it than that?—In the second moon.

Can you tell us in about what decade of the second moon it was?—On or about the 10th of the second moon.

Did you make any payment in consequence of what Cheng On said to you?—I did. I gave the money after Cheng On spoke to me.

How much?—\$1.10 a day.

For how many days was that money paid?—From the second moon to the 11th June.

How often was the money paid?—Tung Kum came for the money every day.

Did you pay him every day?—Yes.

Did you make any payments to Cheng On or were all the payments made to Tung Kum?—They were all made to Tung Kum.

Tell us exactly what Cheng On said to you when he came and asked for this money.—Cheng On said, "There is no gambling in 'No. 12's' place. He wants \$1 a day; I want 10 cents as wages." That is all.

Didn't he say anything else?—Well, I promised to pay him. He told me to hand the money to Tung Kum.

When Cheng On went to speak to you about this money was anyone with him?—He came alone to No. 3, East Street.

Did you pay this money to Tung Kum yourself or was the money handed by your order?—I handed the money personally to Tung Kum.

Defendant—Are you quite sure there was no-one else with Cheng On when he came about the payments?—It seemed to me he was alone. I was alone, but there were foks outside.

His Worship—At the interview you and Cheng On were alone?—We were alone.

Defendant asked permission to recall Cheng On.

His Worship—Very well.

Cheng On was then recalled.

Defendant—On what date were you arrested?—Witness—On the 12th July.

What time?—Between 3 and 4.

Who arrested you?—Inspector Mackie.

You said on the last occasion that you did not know why you were arrested?—Yes, I said that I do not know why I was arrested.

When you were arrested were you shown a warrant?—No, he did not show me a warrant. A warrant was not necessary.

And you have not seen a warrant since?—No.

And you do not know whether there is a warrant for your detention in gaol?—I do not know.

You have been in the Police many years and you know whether it is legal to detain you in prison without a warrant?—Well, I know it is illegal to detain a man without a warrant, but you told me that Mr. May and Mr. Mackie can arrest a person without a warrant. You told me during the interview I had with you upstairs.

I asked you whether you know it is legal to detain a man in gaol without a warrant.

Mr. Francis—I object. It is simply a silly waste of time to ask the witness a legal question.

His Worship—I have already recorded that he knows a warrant is necessary.

Defendant (to witness)—You have been in gaol—

Mr. Francis—This is wholly irrelevant.

His Worship—I see there is a certain amount of relevancy in it.

Mr. Francis—If your Worship thinks so.

Defendant (to witness)—And you remained in gaol without a warrant being issued?

Witness—Well, how can I go away? I do not wish to remain there. I was not allowed to go.

If there is no warrant no one dares to detain you.—I do not know.

His Worship—He is not remaining in gaol of his own free will.

Defendant—Are you allowed to go in and out of the gaol when you like?—No, I am confined in a room.

Did the Captain Superintendent of Police ever tell you there was a warrant?—No.

At this point the case was adjourned until 2.15.

After luncheon Ho Wai Tsim was called, but as he did not appear, after the Court had waited ten minutes, Tung Kum was called. He said—I keep a mercer's shop at 181, Hollywood Road. I know Cheng On and Sam Yeen.

Mr. Francis—Have you ever done anything for Sam Yeen or Cheng On?

Witness—Cheng On told me he had obtained \$1.10 a day for "No. 12," and that I was to go to Sam Yeen, who would give the money to me.

Did you go to Sam Yeen and get money from him?—Yes.

How often did you get money from Sam Yeen?—Once every day.

How much money did you get every day from Sam Yeen?—\$31.55.

Each day?—Yes.

How much of that did you pay to Cheng On?—Cheng On came for the money every five days.

How much did you pay him each five days?—\$5.50.

Did you pay Cheng On anything else but the \$5.50?—Yes.

What was it?—He had a few 10 cent pieces for himself.

What is the total amount you paid him each five days?—\$5.50, \$3.50, which was for himself, and \$8. I do not know who had the \$8.

So that is \$17 every five days?—Yes.

Were you getting any pay yourself from Sam Yeen?—Yes, he gave me a few ten cent pieces as wages.

Of the \$17 you paid every five days to Cheng On how much was for "No. 12"?—Cheng On said \$1.10 was for "No. 12."

Did you get any other money from Cheng On for anyone else?—No.

Do you know Sam Yeen to speak to?—Yes.

Do you know where he lived?—Yes.

Where?—No. 3, East Street.

How long have you known him?—Since last year. He was in a druggist's shop before.

You have been in the Hongkong Police and resigned six years ago after twelve years' service?—Yes.

Was there anything against you?—I resigned of my own accord.

Was there anything against you?—I resigned because my mother was old and there was no one to look after her.

Were there any complaints against you?—No.

You got \$31.50 from Sam Yeen?—Yes.

You got so much money from Sam Yeen: did you distribute it to the people as they came for it?—Yes.

And Cheng On used to come every five days and get \$17 from you?—Yes.

Defendant (cross-examining)—You say you paid every five days \$5.55 to Cheng On for "No. 12"?

Witness—\$5.50.

You paid him in full every five days?—Yes.

How much did you get out of that for wages?—I deducted no wages from that.

In what money did you pay him?—In subsidiary coins.

All?—Yes.

And how much did he receive for himself in addition to that \$5.50?—\$3.50 and \$8.

For himself?—\$3.50 was for himself.

What was the \$3.50 for?—It was for him.

What as?—I do not know; he told me to go to Sam Yeen.

Didn't he tell you what it was for?—He did not.

You are quite sure?—Yes.

Has Cheng On any interest in that gambling affair?—I do not know.

You say you served twelve years in the Police?—Yes.

Did you resign on your own account?—Yes.

Have you got your discharge paper?—I did not ask for a discharge.

After twelve years' faithful service you did not get a discharge?—No; I intended to go to the country and carry on business there.

Have you a pension?—I have.

What kind of a pension have you got?—A commuted pension.

And what was the amount that you received as a commuted pension?—I do not remember; it was \$180 odd.

For twelve years' service?—Yes.

Was that the full amount that you were entitled to?—Yes, and three months' "cumshaw."

There was no deduction for misconduct?—No.

Did you at any time go to Sam Yeen in company with Cheng On?—No.

This concluded the cross-examination and defendant asked his Worship to order all the witnesses to be detained in Court so that they could not communicate with any other witness.

His Worship acceded to the application.

Ho Wai Tsim was then called. He said—I keep a mercer's shop at 118, Jervois Street. It is a shop where Chinese silk is sold. I am the manager. I know Cheng On, whom I recognise in court.

Mr. Francis—Has that man at any time got any samples of silk from you?

Witness—Yes.

Did he get them from you personally or someone else in your employment?—He got them from me personally.

When?—During the first decade of the 4th moon; between the 2nd and 11th May.

Did he get samples of silk on more than one occasion?—Only once.

How many samples did he get at that time?—Three or four.

Did he change those samples or get others at any time?—He came and asked me to change them and I said we had not any more. He did not return the samples.

How soon after he got the first samples did he come and ask for others?—One or two days afterwards. He asked for samples of blue silk.

Did he buy any silk or silk clothing from you at any time?—He bought two pieces of silk cloth.

Was that before or after he got the samples?—Before.

How long before?—Between ten and twenty days.

Did he buy any silk of which you gave him samples?—No.

Did you make any clothes for him?—Yes, two pieces of clothing.

What were they?—One blue silk jacket and one tight silk jacket.

About what time did you make that blue silk jacket?—On the 20th May.

Where did he get the silk from which you made that blue silk jacket?—From my shop. He ordered the jacket in my shop.

Did he pay for the silk and jackets?—No, he has not paid the money.

Does he owe you for them or were they presents?—He owes me.

Is the account entered in the books with the proper date?—Yes.

By what name do you know him?—Cheng Man San.

Is that the man (pointing to Cheng On) who bought the silk and got the samples?—Yes.

Did you know him before he bought this silk?—Yes, I have known him for many years.

Defendant—Do you remember if I have ever been to your shop to get samples or to buy silk?

—No, I do not remember.

Mr. Francis—Your Worship, that is the case for the prosecution, and I would ask your Worship to commit the case for trial. Of course if Mr. Witchell desires to call witnesses here your Worship will be bound to hear them and take their evidence. This is one of those cases your Worship cannot deal with unless you entirely discharge it if you decide there is no case to go to the jury.

His Worship—There are one or two questions which I wish to ask of witnesses before committing. With regard to the list of names, in what light do you wish me to regard that as evidence? It has merely been mentioned as having been found.

Mr. Francis—Your Worship will please bear in mind that I did not put it in evidence. It was called for and put in evidence by the defendant himself; he called for it and asked for its production. Your Worship will remember that I simply brought out the fact of the existence of such a book, but I did not tender it as evidence nor make use of it as evidence.

Defendant—In the other case the Hon. the Captain Superintendent of Police inferred from what he had seen in other account books—

His Worship—One moment.

After looking at the depositions His Worship said—The book having been put in and the defendant wishing to examine further on it—

Mr. Francis—I do not think, according to the ordinary rules with reference to the discovery of new evidence, he has a right to examine anything other than that which refers to him either directly or indirectly. It is a constant practice in the Supreme Court when books of a confidential character are produced, for instance, merchant's books, that only entries referring to the particular transactions are exposed, the witness of course swearing that there is nothing else in the book or in the accounts which in any way refers to the case before the Court or which affects the prisoner. The defendant is entitled to see the entries affecting him if he likes. The defendant asked, "Is there anything in that book referring to me?" and the Captain Superintendent of Police was bound to say there was. The defendant is certainly entitled to see anything in that book referring to himself.

Defendant—I think the book was brought out by counsel. He said that \$1.10 and \$1 had been paid to "No. 12."

Mr. Francis—It was wholly in answer to your question.

Defendant—I think not, sir.

Mr. Francis—If your Worship will look at the evidence you will see that I simply got out the fact that a complete set of accounts was found. The moment Mr. Witchell asked questions about it and insisted upon knowing what entries were in it it became evidence for all purposes.

His Worship asked if the defendant was not entitled to examine the book, it having been put in.

Mr. Francis said no.

His Worship asked for an authority.

Mr. Francis replied that he had no law on the subject with him, but it was the constant practice in the Supreme Court to disclose only such entries as related to the particular case. Counsel also pointed out that he did not think his Worship need trouble himself about the matter as it must be dealt with at the Supreme Court. Of course the book was in the custody of Mr. May and it had been marked by his Worship. The question of how far it was evidence would be disposed of at the Supreme Court.

His Worship (to defendant)—Do you reserve your claim to cross-examine on that book, supposing the case be committed?

Defendant—If your Worship commits the case I will reserve my claim.

His Worship—On that understanding I will say no more about it.

Hon. F. H. May, Captain Superintendent of Police, was then recalled.

His Worship—When did you become Captain Superintendent of Police?

Hon. F. H. May—On the 11th May, 1893.

Were the police regulations, from which you quoted rule 73, made before your time?—Yes, in 1892.

That rule you say refers to constables and not to inspectors; is that so?—Yes.

In those rules and regulations are there any rules referring to Inspectors regarding gambling?—To the best of my knowledge there are not.

What rules have the Inspectors for their guidance? You read out an order the other day; is there any other order for their guidance besides that?—There are other orders.

Those orders would be issued by the Superintendent, would they not?—Yes.

Departmentally?—Yes.

Have the rules and regulations been issued by the authority of the Government?—Yes, but there are some orders which the Captain Superintendent has power to issue himself.

Are there any orders for the guidance of the police to which you would like to call my attention?—Yes. I should like to show you the order to which Inspector Witchell referred.

Is the order you read on Saturday respecting gambling the only order you have issued on that subject?—I think so. I do not remember any other order.

Has this particular order received the sanction of the Government?—No, it was not necessary.

In conjunction with this order there is another?—There is one referring to payment to informers.

His Worship read the order as follows—"Gambling, public. Under instructions from the Governor no payments are to be made by the police until further orders for information given by informers in gambling cases. If the officer in charge of such district considers any informer deserving of reward he may bring such person to the notice of the Magistrate, who may make such a reward under the Ordinance."

Defendant pointed out that that order had been cancelled. There was a later order cancelling the payment of rewards to informers.

His Worship intimated that his object in asking the witness about the regulations was to see to what extent the Inspector had been neglecting his duty in not taking action in the matter. Witness had mentioned the order dividing the town into sections. Was there any other order for the guidance of Inspectors? Of course there was the law itself.

Defendant—I think your Worship will find it in the Gambling Ordinance.

Mr. Francis said he respectfully suggested that his Worship could not decide that point; the case must be committed for trial.

In answer to further questions witness said the Ordinance provided for two classes of gaming houses. One was a public common gaming house and the other a private common gaming house. In the first the public had access and in the second access was limited to persons known to the house.

His Worship—During what time has the defendant had charge of No. 1 section?

Witness—Since August, 1896.

Were the communications in reference to the gambling in Kwai We Lane in the form of letters?—Yes, but unfortunately I have not got them.

Were the communications about a particular house or houses?—One house, No. 5, was mentioned particularly.

Were other houses mentioned?—Yes.

Is the charge of neglect of duty in respect of the gambling house in Kwai Wa Lane?

Mr. Francis interposed and said he framed the charge. The neglect of duty he had in his mind was in not reporting the house about which the Inspector spoke to Cheng On. There was no charge of neglect of duty in respect of any houses in the defendant's own district.

Defendant—I would ask the Captain Superintendent of Police, if the case is going for trial, to produce my character roll for the past fourteen years.

His Worship—I shall commit this case for trial. Will you reserve your defence?

Defendant—I do not see that you have any evidence at all that I knew there was gambling in this house. The prosecution have failed to prove that I had any knowledge there was gambling or that I was seen in the lane driving the people away or anything else. There is no case at all against me. As to the informer, no reliance can be placed on a single word he has said. The prosecution have not proved that I have been in the house or that I drove the people away, as a witness said I told him. The prosecution have not called the man who is said to have called me upstairs and that I was frightened to go. I think it would be an injustice and would put me to a great expense if I am committed for trial. If you do, your Worship, I reserve my defence.

His Worship—The case will be committed for trial.

Mr. Francis—I think I am entitled to ask Your Worship to increase the bail, say two sureties of \$500 each.

Defendant—I object to that. My family here is security enough for me without any other bail in a paltry case of this kind—a trumped up charge brought against me by

that informer probably because I would have nothing to do with arresting people concerned in the brothel.

His Worship—I think the prosecution, is justified in asking for increased bail. The bail will be two sureties of \$500 each or one surety of \$1,000.

Defendant—That is imposing a great hardship upon me after allowing me bail in one surety of \$500.

Mr. Francis—That was pending the investigation. May I ask your Worship to give directions in the office for the early preparation of the depositions? The Attorney-General wishes to take the case at the present Sessions. I believe it will be taken next week. I have no doubt the defendant will be very glad to get it finished and disposed of as soon as possible.

Defendant—I would be glad if your Worship would order a copy of the depositions to be given to me. It is not in my power to pay for it.

His Worship—If I have the power I will do so. I think you are entitled to a copy of the depositions.

Defendant—Thank you, your Worship.

The proceedings then concluded.

HONGKONG SANITARY BOARD.

A meeting of the Hongkong Sanitary Board was held at the offices on the 15th inst. Dr. J. M. Atkinson (Principal Civil Medical Officer) presided, and there were also present—Hon. F. H. May (Captain Superintendent of Police), Hon. W. Chatham (Acting Director of Public Works), Dr. Clark (Medical Officer of Health), and Mr. H. McCallum (Secretary).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

THE BOARD AND ITS SUBORDINATES.

In connection with the motion passed at the last meeting the Secretary wrote the following minute:—With reference to the motion passed at last meeting calling on each and everyone of the subordinate officers, interpreters, and clerks serving under the Board to furnish a full and accurate statement of the business concerns, if any, in which they are interested, I have to report that each of them has been called upon to furnish such a statement. I append answers from 3 clerks, 16 inspectors, 10 interpreters, 1 overseer, 8 foremen, 9 watchmen, 2 shroffs, and 3 tallymen—52 in all. It will be observed that in every case the answer is, "I have no interest in any business concerns whatever."

The PRESIDENT—I move that these papers be laid on the table.

The MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH—I beg to second the resolution and I would also, sir, venture to express the hope that this emphatic and unanimous denial by all the subordinate officers of this Department of the rumours as to their business relations with white-washers, contractors, etc., be accorded the same publicity by the Press as was accorded to the motion of the Vice-President at the last meeting. I think, however, that this matter must not be allowed to rest here, for even the most sanguine members of the Board could hardly have anticipated that even if any black sheep do exist among the subordinate officers of the Board they would be likely to incriminate themselves by giving any other answer than that received by the Board. At the last meeting of the Board the Vice-President spoke of certain evidence which was in existence bearing upon this matter, which evidence I pointed out at that time had never been presented to the Board. The Board is aware of course that various anonymous allegations have been received, but so far as the Board is aware these allegations have never been substantiated; but while this cloud hangs over the subordinate officers of the Department there will always be some people who will attach credence to them, and, therefore, in continuation of the motion of the Vice-President at the last meeting, I beg to propose:—That the Sanitary Board beg to recommend that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to direct that any evidence that may exist to show that any of the subordinate officers of the Board are

concerned in business relations in the colony, be furnished to the Board."

The ACTING DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to second that. I think it is very desirable that the whole information should be before the Board, so that it will then be in the power of the senior officers to look after the men and see that they carry out their duties faithfully.

The CAPTAIN SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE—I beg to move as an amendment that the word "confidential" be added to that resolution. I see no objection to the resolution.

The MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH—I accept that.

The word "confidential" was then added after the word "furnished," and the resolution was carried unanimously.

SWATOW FREE OF PLAGUE.

A communication was read from the Medical Officer of Swatow stating that bubonic plague had disappeared in the South-east and South-west villages of Swatow. The port of Swatow had been free the whole year.

The PRESIDENT moved that the Colonial Secretary be informed that the Board advises that there was no necessity to continue the restrictions on ships arriving here from Swatow.

The MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH seconded. Carried.

PLAGUE IN BOMBAY.

From the 19th May to 9th June there were 223 cases and 127 deaths from bubonic plague in Bombay.

MORTALITY STATISTICS.

For the week ended 3rd July the death rate in the colony was 22.9 per 1,000 per annum, as against 13.8 for the corresponding period of last year. For the week ended 10th July the rate was 22.9 against 19.3 for the corresponding period of last year.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Board adjourned until Thursday week.

THE INDIAN FAMINE FUND.

The following correspondence has been forwarded to us for publication:—

Hongkong 5th May.

Sir,—I have the honour to acquaint you that the local Fund for the relief of the famine in India has been closed and a final meeting of the Committee was held yesterday. A copy of the minutes is enclosed herewith for the information of the Central Committee.

I am desired by our Committee to thank you for the telegrams in acknowledgment of remittances made and at the same time to express the sincere hope that the generous efforts which are being made by the Central Committee for the relief of the suffering people of India will meet with the fullest measure of success.—I am, Sir, Your obedient servant,

(Signed) J. W. CARRINGTON,

Chairman, Committee

Indian Famine Relief Fund.

His Honour Sir Francis W. Maclean, Kt.,
Chairman Central Committee, Calcutta.

Indian Famine Charitable Relief Fund,

Royal Exchange Building.

Calcutta, 5th June 1897.

To His Honour Sir John W. Carrington, C.M.G., Chairman, Indian Famine Relief Committee, Hongkong.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 5th ultimo, in which you inform me that the Fund inaugurated in Hongkong for the relief of the famine stricken people in India, has been closed. I also thank you for the newspaper cutting containing a report of the final meeting of your Committee, which was enclosed with your letter.

All the remittances as specified in the Honorary Treasurer's report, have been received by my Committee.

On behalf of the Central Executive Committee and myself, I beg to thank your Committee and yourself most cordially for the generous response to our appeal issued in the early part of the year, on behalf of the famine stricken people in India. I am grateful to be able to say that we have received invaluable assistance from all parts of the world, and more particularly from great Britain and the British Colonies.

In conclusion, permit me to thank you once more, and also the Honourable J. H. Stewart-Lockhart and Mr. Thomas Jackson, who have so kindly officiated as Honorary Secretary and Honorary Treasurer to your Committee, for your kindness and generosity in thus coming forward to the assistance of India in her time of need.—I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant.

(Signed) FRANCIS W. MACLEAN,
Chairman, Central Executive Committee
Indian Famine Charitable Relief Fund.

THE ARMY AND NAVY AND THE JUBILEE REVIEW.

The following correspondence is published in the Gazette:—

THE GOVERNOR TO GENERAL OFFICER
COMMANDING.

Government House.

Hongkong, 25th June, 1897.

Sir,—On behalf of myself and the civil community of this colony, I desire to convey to your Excellency an expression of grateful thanks for the ready co-operation of the Military Authorities in connection with the recent celebrations in Her Majesty's honour.

The splendid appearance of the Troops at the Review held in the Happy Valley on Tuesday afternoon last could not fail to excite the admiration of all present, and the impressive military ceremony was indeed worthy of the great occasion.

To your Excellency and to the Officers and men under your command the greatest credit and the thanks of the community are due.—I have the honour to be, Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROBINSON.

His Excellency The General Officer Commanding Her Majesty's Forces in China, Hongkong.

THE GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING TO
THE GOVERNOR.

Headquarter Office, 26th June, 1897.

Sir,—I have the honour to express the pleasure felt by myself and by the Regular and Volunteer Troops under my command at learning your Excellency's high appreciation of their soldierly appearance and fine bearing at the recent historic commemoration, and to assure your Excellency that we are at all times ready to co-operate with the inhabitants in all matters bearing on the welfare of the Empire and the colony.—I have the honour to be, your Excellency's most obedient servant.

W. BLACK,
Major-General.

THE GOVERNOR TO THE COMMODORE.

Government House.

Hongkong, 25th June, 1897.

Sir,—On behalf of myself and the civil community of this Colony, I desire to convey to you an expression of grateful thanks for the ready co-operation of the Navy Authorities in connection with the recent celebrations in Her Majesty's honour.

The admirable appearance of the Blue Jackets and the Royal Marines at the Review held in the Happy Valley on Tuesday afternoon last could not fail to excite the enthusiasm of all present, and was worthy of the British Navy and the great occasion.—I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant.

WILLIAM ROBINSON.

Commodore Swinton C. Holland, A. D. C.

THE COMMODORE TO THE GOVERNOR.

"Victor Emanuel," at Hongkong.

28th June, 1897.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's letter No. 86 of 25th instant, which I regard as an additional expression of the very satisfactory relations that exist between the service I have the honour to represent, and the community of this colony, over which your Excellency presides. The extremely hearty manner in which all have joined hands to do honour to our Sovereign Lady proves the domination of loyalty to all other considerations, and it is with untinted satisfaction one contemplates the combined demonstrations, which have recently drawn to a

close.—I have the honour to be, sir, your Excellency's most obedient servant,

SWINTON C. HOLLAND,
Commodore.

His Excellency Sir William Robinson,
G.C.M.G., Governor of Hongkong.

**THE ACCIDENT TO THE LATE
MR. D. K. SLIMAN.**

A Swatow correspondent sends us the following account of the late Mr. D. K. Sliman's fatal accident:—

The saddest and most terribly sudden calamity that the Swatow community has ever known in its personnel has just occurred. Mr. David K. Sliman, Messrs. Jardine, Matheson & Co.'s representative at this port, has come to a most untimely end. To relate it briefly, the deceased left here with a friend in a gig, which was preceded by the steam launch—chartered as usual for the hot weather—for Masu, the summer resort of the residents for the purpose of bathing. Arrived, he appeared to be in his usual excellent health and spirits and entered the water somewhere about six o'clock with his companions for a swim. The sea was full of sand caused by the motion of the waves during the last rough weather. He had swum out some little distance in the direction of the moored sampan and was, apparently failing to reach it, returning to the beach, when suddenly a faint cry—it was the last that ever passed those lips from which such pretty singing has so often charmed his friends—was heard. By this time there were several bathers in the water and one or two, attracted by the cry, turned their heads in the direction of the sound. Mr. Arlt saw the actual disappearance. For a brief second it would appear that the situation was not realized; but this was only for the moment. Instantly it was known, by the shout of one of the bathers "Sliman is down," all in the water hurriedly swam to the spot and began diving in a most plucky manner. His friend in the same firm, Mr. Ross, Mr. Focke, Mr. Arlt, Mr. Courtney, and others searched for him for hours till all hope of recovery by such means was abandoned, and much exhausted themselves they returned to the shore. The black sand with which the water was charged filled the ears of the divers, with painful effect, and it was impossible for them to see anything when below the surface, feeling about being their only resource. The poor fellow went down only some 30 yards distant from the beach for which he was making and in quite shallow water, 7 to 8 feet. Immediate steps were taken to get appliances for dredging and the fishermen were offered anything they chose to ask for their assistance, and to their everlasting shame be it recorded that they absolutely refused to help till they were assured, in writing, of a reward. The tide fortunately was flooding, and between 9 and 10 o'clock the body was washed up on to the sands. On its recovery it was carried up to Kakchio in the Ewo gig and placed for the night in the Chapel, about 11 p.m.

When the dreadful news reached us all were fairly heartbroken and our grief was accentuated when the remains arrived at the Consular jetty and we formed that never-to-be-forgotten melancholy procession under the moonlight, to the Chapel behind the Club. Here were gathered such of the residents on this side as were aware of the sad event and we took a last look at the face of our dead friend. The body lay on a stretcher and was covered by a Chinese flag—the only one then available.

The deceased was a gentleman in every sense of the word: fine instincts, generous, kind hearted, and affable; an excellent business man and a keen athlete. Mr. Sliman's death has caused a gap in our small community which it will be indeed hard to fill and all are full of sympathy with his relatives and friends.

A Coroner's inquest was held at the Consulate on the following day and the jury returned a finding of "accidental drowning." At 5.30 the residents of Swatow assembled en masse at the Chapel and heard the Rev. Mr. Gibson deliver an impressive service and exhortation. It then became known that the remains were to be sent to Hongkong, where the deceased has many friends, for interment. Well, Hongkong cannot mourn his loss more than Swatow does.

DIAMOND JUBILEE SUBSCRIPTIONS.

The Hon. Treasurer begs to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following contributions:—

Already acknowledged	...	\$57,625.84
Granville Sharp	...	1,000
		<hr/> \$58,625.84

**THE "EMPRESS OF JAPAN'S"
QUICK RUN.**

**THE FASTEST VOYAGE ON RECORD ACROSS
THE PACIFIC OCEAN.**

The following are the particulars of the voyage of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's R.M.S. *Empress of Japan*, which arrived here on 14th inst. from Vancouver:—

June 26th, 10.00 a.m.	Left Vancouver for Victoria, B.C.
June 26th, 3.30 p.m.	Arrived Victoria, B.C.
June 26th, 4.10 p.m.	Left Victoria for Yokohama.
July 1st, 7.30 p.m.	Crossed 180th Meridian in lat. 50.37 N.
July 7th, 1.35 p.m.	Arrived Yokohama.

RUNS CROSSING THE PACIFIC OCEAN.		
Date (noon).	Knots.	Remarks.
June 26th	31	Fresh head wind and adverse tide.
" 27th	396	
" 28th	415	
" 29th	414	Moderate variable wind, fine, sea
" 30th	421	smooth.
July 1st	441	
" 3rd	433	
" 4th	432	
" 5th	429	Moderate head winds, fine, sea
" 6th	417	smooth.
" 7th	415	
" 7th p.m. 26		Strong head wind, cloudy, moderate head sea.

Time occupied from Victoria to Yokohama, steaming time, 10 days, 3 hours, 39 minutes. Knots per hour, 17.2.

July 8th 6.00 a.m.	Left Yokohama for Nagasaki.
" 10th 6.45 a.m.	Arrived Nagasaki.
" 10th 0.40 p.m.	Left Nagasaki for Woosung.
" 11th 8.25 p.m.	Arrived Woosung.
" 12th 7.25 a.m.	Left Woosung for Hongkong.
" 14th 0.05 p.m.	Arrived Hongkong.

Yokohama to Hongkong moderate variable winds, fine weather, sea smooth.

THE QUEEN AND EUREKA MINES.

Messrs. John D. Humphreys & Son, the General Managers, send us the following reports, received from Australia:—

Mount Macdonald, 25th June, 1897.

NEW BALMORAL GOLD MINING CO., LTD.

Queen Mine.—The contractors for sinking the main shaft are still making fair progress, the total sunk to date being 52 feet, making the shaft now a depth of 258 feet from the surface. The ground in the bottom is favourable for sinking, and we have now in the shaft what appears to be the main wall of the reef, with small veins of quartz attached to it; but at present we cannot tell for certain if it be the main wall or not. We will be able to tell after a few feet more have been sunk.

Prospecting Shaft.—Since last report work has been suspended here owing to the scarcity of good miners, all the available men being fully employed on other work, and we understand it is something new here for some time to not have men seeking work. We are calling for tenders to extend the drive west, and hope to have the work progressing shortly.

Engine house.—The frame has been completed on an improved principle and is now being covered with iron.

Balmoral Mine.—A tribute has been let to Messrs. Peel and Anderson on a portion of G. L. 5 on advantageous terms to the Company, as well as to them. So far they have done good prospecting work. As soon as men are available we intend starting two prospecting on one of the leases.

p. pro. JOHN HUMPHREYS & SON.
(Sgd.) C. J. WILLMOTT.

Mount Macdonald, 25th June, 1897.

OLIVERS FREEHOLD MINES, LIMITED.

Eureka Mine.—Since reporting on the 28th May, work has been going on satisfactorily as usual. At the 200 feet level the north drive has been extended a total of 105 feet, the reef at this point being 8 feet wide and of fair grade. The south drive has been extended a distance of 62 feet, the reef 4 feet in width and

of average quality. Back stoping is being carried on, above the back of this level (reef varying from 4 to 6 feet in width) both north and south of payable stone. The work of timbering and properly securing the main drive, filling up stopes, and laying train lines is progressing and being completed as required.

At the 150 feet level, the north drive is now being pushed on by three shifts of 2 men each—Total driven 55 feet. The reef here is small, but shows nice gold. As already proved by the winze sunk from this level, the reef increases in size immediately below the level, and it also increases in size above it. In fact it is plainly shown that at the 150 feet level we are driving on what is termed the "tail of the top formation" and it is quite probable that the second formation which makes just under this level, and which is so strong at the 200 feet level, may go hundreds or even thousands of feet before making another break. The main shaft has been sunk 21 feet below the 200 feet level, and timbered 12 feet. The country is improving and we expect to cut the hanging wall of reef at about 42 feet from the 200 ft. level. We have started two men to sink a shaft to connect with rise put up from the 150 ft. level. This shaft was sunk to a depth of 74 feet by previous managers and was originally intended for the main shaft, being timbered and divided into three compartments. From its present depth it will be carried down to connect with the working at the 150 feet level, but on a much smaller scale, being divided into two compartments, one for air and the other for mullock, down which will be thrown refuse to fill up the stopes, thus effecting an immense saving in timber, besides making the workings safe and secure. During the summer months the air compartment will be of great value for ventilation.

p. pro. JOHN D. HUMPHREYS & SON.
C. J. WILLMOTT.

TEBRAU PLANTING CO., LIMITED.

The first general meeting of shareholders in the Tebrau Planting Company, Limited, was held yesterday, in the Company's Offices, Queen's Road Central. Mr. Hart Buck presided and there were also present—Messrs. C. Ewins, H. Humphreys, G. Murray Bain, R. E. Humphreys, J. S. Hagen, E. K. Chandler, W. D. Sutton, and A. P. Nobbs.

Mr. H. HUMPHREYS read the notice convening the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN—Gentlemen, this meeting, as you are aware, is simply a statutory one, and we have no particular business to transact. I will, however, take this opportunity of saying a few words about our property and prospects. Our property, which consists of 2,000 acres of fertile land in Johore, we hold on lease for 999 years from the Johore Government. 200 acres of this land have been for some years planted with gambier, which is the staple product of Johore, and the results have shewn a good profit. In addition to this 200 acres of gambier, we are now working on 300 acres which we intend to plant with Liberian coffee, and as we are informed that our land is in every way suitable for the cultivation of coffee we look forward with a good deal of confidence to our enterprise proving successful. We have been fortunate in securing the services of Mr. M. Larken as manager. He is a gentleman well known in Hongkong and on the China Coast generally, and has the reputation of being one of the best planters in the Straits Settlements. Our last advices from Singapore inform us that everything is going on satisfactorily, and that they are hard at work on the 300 acres which are being cleared for planting. I say all, in conclusion, that Mr. Larken has a large monetary interest in our undertaking, and I am quite confident from my personal knowledge of him that he will do everything in his power to make our enterprise a success. Unless any shareholder would like further information there is no further business before the meeting.

No questions were asked.

The CHAIRMAN—That concludes the business of the meeting, gentlemen. I thank you for your attendance.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.]

LEKIN CHARGES AT WUCHOW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY PRESS."

Dear Sir,—After perusal of the leading article in your issue of the 10th instant I had an interview with the agents of the Company which has been formed to farm the collection of Ti-shui (lit: local tax) on kerosine and matches in Kwangsi, and as the information I have gleaned from them may be of interest to the general public, I shall feel obliged by your finding space for it in your valuable columns. The agent of the Company assures me that there is no intention whatever on the part of the Company to extend its operations to piece goods and other articles of import, or, with the privileges it is supposed to enjoy, to undersell kerosine and matches imported by itself with the object of ultimately having a monopoly of these two articles in the province of Kwangsi. In fact the Company is prepared to give up the right to import kerosine and matches and to confine itself to the collection of the tax fair and square to all parties similar to what is being done in Canton. According to the statistics collected by the Chinese officials for the last few years the yearly import of kerosine is under 100,000 cases, as against 200,000 cases estimated by you, and that of matches is under 10,000 cases, as against 20,000 cases estimated by you. The Company charges 30 cents per case on kerosine and \$2 per case on matches. After payment of the import duty and the above charge, kerosine and matches can be sent to any part of Kwangsi without further taxation, and no transit passes are required. Therefore it is incorrect to say that the foreigners will have to pay 45 cents per case on kerosine. If the Chinese Government can be induced to abolish likin and local taxes altogether, well and good, but if this cannot be done, do you not think it would be better to have a uniform and fixed charge at the port of importation instead of all the irregular charges one has to pay *en route*, as has been done hitherto? In taking out transit passes, one has to declare where the goods are intended for, and when the goods reach the place of destination, he has to dispose of them there, even when there is a better market elsewhere, whereas if he pays 30 cents per case on kerosine at Wuchow, he will be free to send the kerosine to one place and then to another without any further payment. The Foreign Powers have all along agitated for one uniform charge. Now they have got it at Kwangsi as far as kerosine and matches are concerned, and yet there seems to be some objection on the part of the foreigners. I do not know whether the Chamber of Commerce or the representatives of Foreign Powers will take up the matter referred to in the article under review or not, but I hope that no steps will be taken by them until they see whether the trade at Wuchow will be injuriously or advantageously affected by the creation of the kerosine and matches farm, as it will not do for us to cry before we are hurt. There is a kerosine farm at Canton too, and although the Chinese and foreigners receive the same treatment from the farmer there, no kerosine oil has been imported into Canton by foreigners for many years past. The principal argument in your article referred to is that foreigners will be ousted from all direct share in the business of distribution owing to the preferential privilege this Company is supposed to enjoy. I am, however, of opinion that no matter whether this Company exists or not, and allowing that all foreigners and natives are treated alike, in course of time no kerosine oil or matches will be imported into Wuchow by foreigners, as Wuchow is in every way similar to Canton. Hongkong and Shanghai are the places for foreigners as far as import goes, but in all the Yangtze or West River ports, they could never be able to compete with the natives, on account of the natural advantages the latter possess, as correctly stated by you. Are there any foreign firms in the Yangtze river ports which do any imports worth mentioning? Their business is entirely confined to shipping

and-or exports to Foreign countries. The sole question is whether the import trade will suffer in the hands of natives, and it will not do to study the interest of private individuals. The Company will buy all kinds of oil and with big capital will be able to push on the trade much quicker than if the trade is left in the hands of small people who naturally want larger margin for profits. Another point we must not forget is that the Chinese have no kerosine of their own and whatever goes to Wuchow comes from the foreign countries and I fail to see what difference it will make whether the foreigners sell kerosine in Hongkong for Wuchow or sell it at Wuchow.—Yours truly,

B. F. S. R.

Hongkong, 19th July, 1897.

HORRIBLE OUTRAGE IN ACHEEN.

THE "PEGU" RAIDED.
CAPTAIN ROSS KILLED AND MANY
WOUNDED.

The *Straits Times* publishes the following special telegrams:—

Penang, 12th July.

The Achinese have raided the steamer *Pegu* on the coast between Edie and Teluk Semawe. The chief officer and fourteen of the crew are in the hospital at Teluk Semawe, from wounds received during the attack. Captain Ross, the master of the *Pegu*, and others were killed.

Eighteen thousand dollars, besides property, were carried off by the Achinese.

The *Pegu*, says our contemporary, is a Penang coaster, which left that port on the 7th instant for Achee. The ports of call were Edie, Teluk Semawe, Segli, and Olehle. The latter is the capital of the Dutch territory in Achee Proper. Garrisons are stationed on the coast at Edie, Teluk Semawe, and Segli, but the Dutch have hardly any power outside the forts. Insecurity prevails ashore. The pepper trade draws ships to these places especially to Edie. The Achinese there are lawless and notorious for piracy.

Captain Ross, who has met his death in this affray, has for many years been a trader with the Achinese, and, at the time that he was murdered, was, probably, the largest dealer in Achinese pepper. Although on two previous occasions he had been attacked and seriously wounded by the Achinese, once almost, to the point of death, he seemed to have the greatest confidence in himself and in the treacherous natives with whom he was dealing. Frequently he has been warned by the Dutch authorities of the risks that he ran in going practically unarmed into the midst of the native country, and it is probable that on this occasion the Achinese knew well that there was a large sum of money on board, and that the *Pegu* was not equipped for an effective resistance against considerable numbers of Achinese pirates.

It is very improbable that the attack on the *Pegu* was made from outside, and that this was a piracy on the old fashioned lines. What is most likely is that at one of the ports of call a number of desperadoes took passage in some innocent guise, and that, on a given signal, they rose and attacked the crew. Unprepared as the officers would probably be, their task would not be a difficult one, and, after taking away all the bullion and portable property, it is likely that they left the vessel to take its chance. This was the case with the piracy of the steamer *Namoa* on the China coast some years ago. The fact, however, that there was much bloodshed indicates that, though probably surprised, the Captain, officers, and crew made a desperate resistance.

The *Free Press* recalls the fact that in July 1893, four years ago, between the same ports, the Achinese aboard of *Rajah Kongsj Atjeh* rose and seized the vessel, murdering Captain J. Woods, and the Chief Officer, Mr. H. Alexander, and killing passengers and crew indiscriminately to the number of 24 killed and 15 wounded.

Subject to audit the Directors of the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank intend to declare a dividend of £1 5s. for the last half-year, placing five lacs to the reserve fund, and carrying forward about three lacs.

DEATH BY DROWNING OF
GENERAL DE BADENS.

The Saigon papers publish a telegram from the Resident Superior of Tonkin to the Lieutenant-Governor at Saigon, dated Hanoi, 10th July, notifying that General de Badens had been drowned on the Upper Claire River. A Havas telegram dated Paris, 12th July, states that the General had been appointed a Commander of the Legion of Honour. Presumably the news of his death had not reached Paris when the appointment was made.

Tonkin papers received later contain the following general order issued by the Commander-in-Chief in Tonkin in reference to the death of general de Badens:—A shocking misfortune has thrown into mourning the corps of occupation in Indo-China. Brigadier General de Badens, commanding the third and fourth territories, on a tour of inspection was returning from Thanhuy to Hagiang by water. The boat in which he embarked with Commandant Nouvel, of the Hagiang circle, capsized. General de Badens was caught by a strong current, caused by a freshet. A tirailleur who was pushing a bamboo towards him was also caught and both disappeared. Commandant Nouvel was saved. Search is being made on both banks for the recovery of the bodies. General de Badens possessed a fine spirit, large intelligence, and a love of work which led him to acquire on every subject the most accurate knowledge. Of a benevolent character, occupying himself unceasingly in promoting the well-being of those who served under him, General de Badens was a man of mark with a great future before him. He died in the discharge of his duty. His sudden death, occurring under such sad circumstances, is a cruel blow to his family. The corps of occupation will unreservedly associate themselves in their mourning. The corps loses a tried chief of great value and the Marine Infantry one of its most brilliant officers.

THE BELGIAN SYNDICATE AND
ITS CONTRACT.

We have been able after some little trouble to secure a summary of the important Convention recently signed in Peking between the Belgian Syndicate and the Chinese for the construction of the Hankow-Peking Railway and for the financing of that undertaking. The original is in French and Chinese. Our Special Correspondent in the Chinese capital, whom we deputed to unearth the secret, which has been most successfully accomplished, translates from the Chinese text:—

1.—The Chinese Company having the concession for the construction of the railway from Peking to Hankow has a capital of Tls. 13,000,000, and in addition to this capital has the permission of the Imperial Chinese Government to raise a loan of £4,500,000.

2.—The Belgian Syndicate is to contract for this loan at a discount of 10 per cent., i.e. £4,050,000 in four instalments. Each instalment is to consist of £1,012,500.

1st instalment to be paid on 3rd Jan., 1898.
2nd " " " " 3rd July, "
3rd " " " " 3rd Jan., 1899.
4th " " " " 3rd July, "

The delivery of this loan to be made in a bank in Peking, the bank to be selected by the Chinese Company. (The Russo-Chinese Bank has been selected.—ED).

3.—The interest, at 4 per cent., to be paid on 7th Jan., 1899, and on the same date each year thereafter.

4.—The Chinese Company will commence to repay the capital only in the year 1903, and the repayments to be completed in 20 years in equal instalments of £225,000, and the bank to receive these repayments is to be selected by the Belgian Syndicate.

5.—The guarantee of capital and interest will be on the following conditions: that the Chinese Company will apply through the Chinese Government for permission to mortgage [to the Syndicate] the property of the railway from Peking and Hankow, and such property cannot be given in any other mortgage.

6.—The construction of the railway shall be finished in 1903. Should the Company wish to extend the time the Belgian Syndicate must

consult with the direction of the Chinese Company to settle the condition of the extension.

7.—No foreigners in China will be permitted to obstruct the performance of this Convention. If the Chinese (Government) should become involved in war with any other country, and in case the assistance of the Belgian employees should be required by the Chinese Government the said employees shall not be at liberty to refuse to give such assistance.

8.—It is agreed that the Belgian Syndicate shall send a competent engineer to control the construction of the railway in its own interest, and at the same time the same engineer will take charge of the plans; but all such plans shall be submitted to the Chief of the Chinese Company for authorization. This engineer shall be under the sole control of Chief of the Chinese Company and the control of the railway will be always in the hands of the Chinese Company. Within the limit of the time the salary of the engineer will be paid by the Chinese Company and fixed by the Belgian Syndicate.

9.—All employees of construction and administration shall be recommended by the Belgian Syndicate, and accepted by the Chief of the Chinese Company and the contract with the employees for a long or short time shall be only determined by the Chief of the Chinese Company, and all other employees beside the Chief Engineer of the Belgium Company shall be under the strict control of the Chief of the Chinese Company; every employee, either foreign or Chinese, shall be in perfect accord.

10.—All that is included in clauses 8 to 9, with reference to the foreign employees. If any irregularities shall arise which could affect the personal reputation of the foreign employees the Chief of the Chinese Company will have to inform the Chief Engineer in order to take steps to annul the contract between the Company and employee.

11.—All material that cannot be made in China shall be purchased in a foreign country. The half of this material shall be furnished by the Belgian Syndicate at a price which shall be equal to or lower than any other tender; the other half will be offered to public tender and the Belgian Syndicate will have the right to furnish it at the price which may have been previously offered by any other private source than public tender. If there be any material which cannot be divided in such a manner as to be offered at public tender, the Belgian Syndicate will have the right to furnish such material at such price as any that have been offered to the Chinese Company from private sources; these terms apply also to freight on the said material.

12.—The Belgian Syndicate is entitled to have a commission of 5 per cent. on any material furnished by the company, but the material from Peking to Pao ting-fu shall be excluded.

13.—Each company will send a representative to Belgium to examine the material; their salaries and expenses shall be paid by their respective companies. In case there be any disagreements between them, an expert in such matters is to be appointed arbitrator, the fees to be paid by the party found to be in the wrong.

14.—The Belgian Syndicate and Chinese Company will not cede their right to any one else.

15.—If in case of *force majeure* the Chinese Company shall not be able to pay the interest agreed upon and the amortization the Chinese Company and Belgian Syndicate agree to extend the time during which payment is to be made and on the same terms and interest. If the Chinese Company shall pay the whole capital before the expiration of the term, interest to cease from that date.

16.—Ratification to be made two months after the signing of this contract to be approved by the Chinese Government.

17.—This contract to be made in French and Chinese; if any difficulty arise re the interpretation of the contract, the two languages will be taken and accounted valid.—*China Gazette*.

We have received from the Harbour Master a copy of the following telegram from the Master Attendant, Singapore:—"Singapore, 17th July. Steamer *Farfalla* missing between Condor and Anamba. Advise steamers going that direction render assistance."

THE KING OF SIAM CHANGES HIS PLANS.

HE GOES TO RUSSIA FOR POLITICAL REASONS.

His Majesty has changed the programme of his visit to European capitals. From Switzerland he has visited Italy instead of going on to Paris as was first intended. It is now learned that Paris will be left out of the royal programme until after the King has returned from Russia and paid his respects to the Czar at St. Petersburg.

In Siamese circles two reasons are heard discussed for this change of programme. It is affirmed—with what truth we cannot say—that the King had intended, if possible, discussing the political situation with M. Hanotaux, but that Prince Serasti was given a hint that such an irregular proceeding would not be followed by the French Minister.

The second reason alleged for the change of programme is, that the King hopes to meet President Faure in St. Petersburg during the visit of the French President to the Czar, and will endeavour to interest the Czar in the political condition of the country with a view of securing his influence with the French President. It is also alleged that His Majesty will probably endeavour to discuss Franco-Siamese difficulties with President Faure while he is in the Russian capital. It is, however, very improbable that either the Czar or President Faure will interfere in the negotiations between the diplomatic agents of the Republic and Siam.—*Siam Free Press*.

HWAI RIVER COUNTRY.

Having recently spent six months' time in travelling in the region usually known under the above caption, it may interest your readers to hear something from that large and somewhat unknown region, and especially as regards its possibilities for trade. The Hwai River Country may be roughly outlined as embracing the northern third of the province of Anhwei and the eastern half of that of Honan—a district of about 50,000 square miles with a population estimated at 25,000,000. Topographically it is a high and almost treeless plain gently sloping toward the south-east, with a few hills near the water courses to break the monotony of the landscape. The soil is fertile, in most places exceedingly so, and produces large crops of wheat, millet, hemp, tobacco and opium, as well as various kinds of vegetables and fruits, while horses, mules, donkeys, cattle, sheep, goats, and hogs are reared in great numbers, but from a lack of proper trade relations with the outer world these products are exchanged in a limited amount only with the surrounding districts for other commodities. The people are industrious and intelligent, and only need the proper encouragements to develop into a thriving commercial people. At present a limited amount of trade is carried on with the port of Chinkiang, and we think that if the proper effort was made by those engaged in the development of trade in China a large and remunerative market could be built up in oil, lamps, clocks, matches, cotton, woollen and linen goods, timber and agricultural implements and machinery. The last named should be manufactured especially for the Chinese market, and until the trade was established efficiency would need to be sacrificed in a measure to cheapness and the prejudices of the people, especially in the matter of design. On the other hand a large supply of wheat, millet, hides, wool, and perhaps tobacco could be found that would find, under proper care, a ready market in other parts of China or abroad. This entire region is watered by the Hwai River and its many tributaries, and is thus in direct communication with the port of Chinkiang via the Grand Canal and Hwai River, which route we found by frequent soundings to furnish a channel with a minimum depth of about four feet of water, during the low water season, as far as the large city of Chengyang-kwan, some 400 miles from Chinkiang, and I believe that a line of light draught steamers could successfully ply on this route were permission granted by the proper authorities.—*Shanghai Daily Press Correspondent*.

ATTACK ON A GOVERNMENT STATION IN NORTH BORNEO.

MAT SALLEH AGAIN.

A EUROPEAN OFFICER CAPTURED.
The *Singapore Free Press* publishes the following special telegram:—

Labuan, 12th July.

The British North Borneo Government Station at Gaya was attacked by sixty rebels under Mat Salleh on Sunday morning.

The town and Government Treasury were burnt and looted.

One police corporal and two prisoners were killed.

Mr. S. Neubronner, the Treasurer, has been taken prisoner.

Mr. Godfrey Howett and Mr. Joseph Wheatley have left Labuan this morning in the steamer *Ranee* with eight Dyak police.

They should reach Gaya at noon to-day.

[On the 23rd September last three North Borneo officials, Messrs. Flint, Dunlop and Little, with their police force, attacked the fort erected by Mat Salleh, the notorious brigand, outlaw and murderer, and compelled him and his followers to take to flight into the interior, leaving several dead unburied. The captured stockade was burnt.]

CANTON NOTES.

[FROM THE "CHUNG NGOI SAN PO."]
Viceroy Tau has applied for two months' leave on account of sickness. His Excellency still resides in his Yamen, but declines to act with reference to public affairs except in cases of great importance.

The West River in Namhoi, Samsui, San-oi, and Suntak districts is again higher than usual by three feet. In some parts it nearly overflows its banks. The natives of the districts mentioned are now hurriedly repairing the dykes and villages are keeping constant watch on the river.

The police are very active in making raids on gambling houses, under instructions from the Governor. A good many cases have been brought to light and many offenders have been convicted. Some fantan gambling houses have been sealed up by the Government. H.E. the Governor went himself in the disguise of one of the common people to make inquiries concerning crime of all descriptions on the night of the 10th instant and several following nights.

New regulations concerning the *Toi-pau* likin levied on coal have been posted up. Every ton of coal of first quality is to be charged six candareens, and that of second quality three candareens. Every hundred catties of native coal is charged one-tenth of a candareen. Comparing this new regulation with the old one the likin duty is now a little lighter.

A curious story is told to the effect that the sea in Kinchow district is exceedingly clear, so that the bottom can be seen distinctly from the surface. It is said that if the bottom of the sea can be seen distinctly from the surface a sage will soon appear.

A fight broke out a fortnight ago in the village named Sheangtak, in Hoifong district, between the two clans named Wong and Ku. The result was that the Ku clan was defeated. Over forty of its men were killed. The case was reported to the local Magistrate, who sent some soldiers to be stationed there.

HONGKONG.

The sensational scandal caused by the alleged acceptance of bribes by police officers has culminated in the arrest of Inspector Witchell, who has been committed for trial on charges of neglect of duty and receiving bribes. Two interesting cases have been heard in the Supreme Court, but naturally the scandal is the sole topic of conversation.

There were 2,400 visitors to the City Hall Museum last week, of whom 185 were Europeans.

Manila has established nine days' quarantine upon arrivals from Amoy, and a precautionary observation of one day in the case of arrivals from Hongkong.

The appointment of Mr. A. Seth to be Acting Assistant Registrar-General and Deputy Registrar of Marriages is gazetted.

The death rate last month was, for the British and Foreign Community civil population, 25.5, and for the Chinese population 20.9.

A proclamation is published in the *Gazette* revoking the proclamation of the 1st May declaring Swatow to be infected with plague.

Wuchow, we hear, is infected with public gambling houses, and the prevalence of gambling is said to be a great hindrance to the prosperity of that important trade centre.

The maximum temperature last month was 89.8, on the 5th, and the minimum 72, on the 29th, the mean for the month being 81.5. The rainfall amounted to 23.355 inches.

It is notified in the *Gazette* that Mr. N. J. Ede has been appointed a member of the Sanitary Board for a further period of three years from the 17th June last.

On the 16th inst. the Douglas steamer *Haitan* (Captain Roach) was gaily decorated in honour of the 300th trip she has made from Hongkong to coast ports. The *Haitan* was built in 1887.

We understand that most of the Foochow machine made tea of which trial was to be made on the London market was shipped by the unfortunate steamer *Allen*, so that it will not be until further shipments go forward that it will be seen how this class of leaf is received.

At the second annual general meeting of Bell's Asbestos Eastern Agency, Limited (carrying on business in Hongkong, Shanghai, and Singapore), which was held at the Company's offices, 18, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C., on the 18th June, the report and accounts for the year ending 31st December, 1896, were adopted.

About ten o'clock on Friday night the firing of bombs and the discharge of rockets in Telegraph Bay caused considerable commotion amongst naval and police circles. A telephone message of the occurrence was received from Pokfulam at the Central Police Station and Inspector Duncan at once communicated with the water police. The rockets were also observed from the Peak by Commodore Holland and he telephoned to the Naval Yard giving instructions for a launch to be despatched to Telegraph Bay with all haste. This launch and a police pinnace reached the spot in a short time, but they had to return with no sure information of the origin of the bombs and rockets. A certain hired launch, however, is suspected.

An interesting match was brought off on the 15th inst. at the Happy Valley between Mr. Gray's Rockhall and Mr. Master's Codfish. Mr. Crane rode Rockhall and Mr. Master rode his own pony. The match was a non-speculative one and was really a trial of the two ponies. It will be remembered that at the Diamond Jubilee Gymkhana last Saturday Rockhall, ridden by Mr. Master, beat Codfish, ridden by Mr. Gedge, in the race for the Champion cup, and it was thought that if Mr. Master had been mounted on his own pony that animal would have won the race. The result of the match proved Codfish to be the better pony. Both jockies were weighed out at 10st. 12lbs. and Mr. T. F. Hough acted as starter. The distance was a mile and a capital race resulted in Codfish getting home by a neck in the very good time of 2 mins. 9 7-16 secs.

The Singapore Secretary of the Raub Australian Gold Mining Co., Limited, has received the following telegram from Raub, dated 8th July:—"Crushing finished, 2,433 tons stone realized 2,120 ounces smelted gold." The *Free Press* says:—"It will be seen from the above that the value of stone put through the mill keeps well up, and indeed a long way over the half ounce standard that was formerly deemed a very decent payable quality for Raub. We would again point out, what the general public cannot be expected to understand or keep in mind, that the great bulk of the stone now going through the battery is stone that has to be removed, no matter what its value, to make those horizontal tunnels or "drives," and those vertical shafts between level and level called "winzes" that are needed to give access and ventilation to the reef. The value of the out-turn at £3.18s. per ounce (possibly more as Raub Gold is of specially fine quality) would be £8,268 for the two months; or, say, at a two-shilling dollar \$82,680.

On Saturday Mr. C. Osmund, first clerk in the Registrar General's department, was interdicted from office, pending further inquiry into the present scandal.

MISCELLANEOUS.

At Haiphong on the 6th July an explosion of gunpowder took place in a fireworks factory, in which work was actively proceeding in preparation for the fetes of the 14th July. The factory itself was almost completely destroyed and the neighbouring houses much shaken, but no one was hurt except a native workman through whose carelessness the accident occurred, and he was only slightly burnt.

A terrible danger, says the *Batavia Newsblad*, threatens sugar planters in Java, from a widespread disease which attacks the roots of the cane. The roots rot and the canes die. The cause of the disease is not known, nor has any remedy for it been found. The planters stand helpless before the disease, which may ere long bring on a failure of the sugar crop. It has already struck four provinces, and has broken out even on well kept estates.

The *Japan Advertiser's* Hakodate correspondent, writing on June 26th, said:—Captain Melville F. Cutler and twenty-four of the crew of the British schooner *Agnes McDonald* arrived here to-day on board of the Japanese steamer *Jinyu Maru*. On the 20th, while the schooner was running for Akeshi during a dense fog, the roar of the surf was heard close by. The schooner was immediately brought to the wind and both anchors were let go in 18 fathoms of water. The wind, however, increased to a gale with a tremendous sea during the night of the 20th, and although all chain was paid out the schooner began to drag her anchors. She finally struck on the 21st at 4.30 a.m. Immediately on striking, the boats were got out and the skins (489 in number) and various stores were landed. By 6 a.m. the schooner began to break up and she was then abandoned and the crew proceeded to Akeshi, about five ri distant. The schooner, one of the finest in the sealing fleet, was built in 1891 in Shelburne, Nova Scotia. She was 107 tons register and one of the most successful sealers in the business.

In its translations from Netherlands-Indian papers the *Straits Times* has the following:—People in Java wonder at the petroleum fever catching so readily in Holland. There the success of oil-boring in Langkat had made so much stir, that Java oil ventures quickly took with the public for a time. It is pointed out that, of the many oil-borings put down in Java, only a few have proved remunerative. But thousands of guilders have been spent by prospectors in seeking, but never finding oil. One company, which works with British capital, has been boring fruitlessly in that island during the last two years, and a large portion of its money has gone without result. Yet, in Holland, investors for a while went eagerly into oil companies without inquiring closely into their prospects. Many of the oil grounds proposed to be worked in Java have never been tested, and it remains to be seen whether they are worth anything. In Java, itself, there is no such eagerness for oil investment. In Holland, a reaction set in at the end of May, when quotations for petroleum shares began to droop. The shares had, by that time, mostly fallen into the hands of speculators. Hence, a crash is looked forward to, the moment misfortune befalls the holders. Speculation is also fanned by the success of the Dordt Petroleum Company in Java. The company makes such headway that oil meets with a constantly increasing demand. This company has great things in view. It hopes to convey oil from a distance of about one hundred miles to Sourabaya, through piping, and intends to connect all its selling stations there by telephone.

COMMERCIAL.

TEA.

EXPORT OF TEA FROM CHINA TO ODESSA.

	1897-98	1896-97
	lbs.	lbs.
Shanghai and Hankow	14,229,694	16,584,567

EXPORT OF TEA FROM CHINA TO GREAT BRITAIN.

	1897-98	1896-97
	lbs.	lbs.
Canton and Macao	1,827,448	1,778,140
Shanghai and Hankow	7,559,606	11,193,431
Foochow	5,454,174	6,650,828
	14,841,228	19,627,399

EXPORT OF TEA FROM CHINA TO UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	1897-98	1896-97
	lbs.	lbs.
Shanghai	2,489,194	1,721,012
Amoy	3,883,944	2,506,045
Foochow	1,323,068	2,634,556
	7,701,246	6,862,513

EXPORT OF TEA FROM JAPAN TO UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	1897-98	1896-97
	lbs.	lbs.
Yokohama	11,716,105	8,571,494
Kobe	5,758,740	3,180,870
	17,474,845	11,752,364

SILK.

SHANGHAI, 16th July. (From Messrs. A. B. Burkill & Sons' Circular).—London advices to 13th current quote a firm market, Gold Kilin 8/10½, Blue Elephant 9/6. Raw Silk.—Business during the week has been confined to very small transactions. The market closes quiet with sellers of Gold Kilins at Tls. 405. Tsattees.—150/200 bales are settled at quotations. Tayaams.—about 50 bales Woozie have changed hands at last week's quotations. Yellow Silks.—150/200 bales are reported settled at quotations.—Arrivals, as per Customs Returns, 8th to 14th July: 1,390 bales White, 191 piculs Yellow, and 84 piculs Wild Silks. Filatures and Re-reels.—Steam Filatures have changed hands, probably for New York, at Tls. 670 to 680 for 13/15 deniers, in hand Filatures and Re-reels there is nothing doing. The Export of Steam Filatures to date is: to Continent 415 bales, to America 718 bales. Waste Silk.—We hear of no transaction on this market in New Waste. Pongees—Shantung.—1,000 pieces have been settled on the following basis:—

	Tls.	Stkg.
	per picul.	per lb.
Tsattees.—Black Lion 2	535	12 1/4
" " 3	50	10 9
" " 3 1/2	485	11 1/4
" Gold Kilin	405	9 5/8
" Blue Double Elephant	397 1/2	9 3/4
" Three Pagodas	387 1/2	9 0
Tayaams.—9 by 12 Moss Green Stork 3	380	8 11
Yellow Silk.—Meeyang Nos 1 & 2 320 a 340 7 6 1/2 a 8 0	20 30	
" Mienchow 1 1/2	340	8 0
" Wengchow	280 a 285 6 8 a 6 9 1/2	17 75

EXPORT OF SILK FROM CHINA AND JAPAN TO EUROPE.

	1897-98	1896-97
	bales.	bales.
Shanghai	6,539	2,995
Canton	1,200	2,000
	7,739	4,995

EXPORT OF SILK FROM CHINA AND JAPAN TO AMERICA.

	1897-98	1896-97
	bales.	bales.
Shanghai	1,076	230
Canton	60	100
	1,676	330

CAMPION

HONGKONG, 20th July.—The market continues steady. Quotations for Ferosa are nominally \$46.50 to \$47.00. Sales, 150 piculs.

SUGAR.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—The market has steadied a little and prices are firmer. Quotations are:—
Shanghai, No. 1, White... \$7.20 to 7.22 per picul
do. " 2, White... 6.67 to 6.70 "

Shekloong, No. 1, Brown...\$4.40 to 4.43 per picul,
do. " 2, Brown... 4.27 to 4.30 "
Swatow, No. 1, White... 7.12 to 7.15 "
do. " 2, White... 6.51 to 6.54 "
Swatow, No. 1, Brown... 4.30 to 4.32 "
do. " 2, Brown... 4.20 to 4.23 "
Soochow Sugar Candy11.02 to 11.05 "
Shekloong " 9.51 to 9.54 "

MISCELLANEOUS EXPORTS.

The P. & O. steamer *Ravenna*, sailed on the 15th July. For Manchester:—200 bales waste silk and 3 cases silk piece goods. For London:—100 bales waste silk, 15 bales raw silk, 3 cases silk piece goods, 2 cases feathers, and 1 case cigars. For Gibraltar:—2 cases curios and 2 cases silk piece goods. For France:—544 bales raw silk, 100 bales waste silk, 4 cases silk piece goods, and 387 packages tea. For Milan:—40 bales raw silk. For Malta:—1 case piano.

The steamer *Myrmidon*, sailed on the 15th July. For London:—5,047 boxes tea (105,567 lbs. S. caper), 20 cases essential oil, 13 cases blackwoodware, 2 cases feathers, 218 bales canes, and 3 packages sundries. For London and/or Manchester:—100 bales waste silk. For London and/or Hamburg:—20 cases bristles. For Glasgow:—1 case silverware. For Hamburg:—25 cases bristles. For Hamburg and/or Antwerp:—25 cases bristles. From Amoy for London:—843 $\frac{1}{2}$ chests tea, 515 boxes tea, and 43 packages tea.

OPIUM.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—Bengal.—There has been a small advance in the price of New Patna and a similar decline in that of New Benares, other descriptions remaining unchanged. Current quotations are New Patna \$720, Old Patna \$775, and New Benares \$717 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Malwa.—Very old drug has improved in value, other qualities continuing steady at last figures. Latest quotations are as under:—

New (this yr's) \$760 with all'ance of 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ catties.
" (last yr's) \$780 " up to 1 "
Old (3/5 ") \$800 " to 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
Older \$820 " to 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ "

Persian.—There has not been any change in prices during the past week the market closing firm at \$500 to \$610 for Oily, and \$510 to \$615 for Paper-wrapped, according to quality.

To-day's stocks are estimated as under:—

New Patna.1,330 chests.
Old Patna 57 "
New Benares 170 "
Malwa 300 "
Persian 800 "

COURSE OF THE HONGKONG OPIUM MARKET.

DATE.	PATNA.		BENARES.		MALWA.	
	New.	Old.	New.	Old.	New.	Old.
1897.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
July 15	720	775	720	—	760/780	800/810
July 16	720	775	720	—	760/780	800/810
July 17	720	775	720	—	760/780	800/810
July 18	720	775	720	—	760/780	800/810
July 19	720	775	717 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	760/780	800/810

RICE.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—Holders are firm and prices are again advancing. Quotations are:—

Saigon, Ordinary\$2.50 to 2.52
" Round, good quality 2.64 to 2.67
" Long 2.72 to 2.75
Siam, Field, mill cleaned, No. 2 ... 2.55 to 2.58
" Garden, " No. 1 ... 2.77 to 2.80
" White 3.62 to 3.65
" Fine Cargo 3.87 to 3.90

COALS.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—Market firm and fair business done. Quotations are:—

Cardiff\$16.50 to 18.00 ex ship.
Australian ... 7.75 to 10.00 ex ship, steady
Miike Lump... 8.00 to 8.25 ex ship, nominal
Miike Small... 7.25 to 8.00 none offering
Moji Lump ... 7.75 to 8.50 ex ship, sales

MISCELLANEOUS IMPORTS.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—Amongst the sales reported are the following:—
YARN AND PIECE GOODS:—Bombay Yarn.—50 bales No. 8 at \$85, 430 bales No. 10 at \$85

to \$94.50, 285 bales No. 12 at \$84 to \$95.50, 115 bales No. 16 at \$86 to \$96, 430 bales No. 20 at \$95.50 to \$106. Japanese Yarn.—110 bales at \$105 to \$106.25.—Grey Shirtings.—1,500 pieces at \$105 to \$106.25. 10 lbs. Blue 5 Men at \$3.87 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,250 pieces 10 lbs. Red 5 Men at \$3.37 $\frac{1}{2}$, 3,200 pieces 7 lbs. Large Eagle at \$1.97 $\frac{1}{2}$, 2,400 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Red 7 Boys at \$2.62 $\frac{1}{2}$, 600 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. 3 Dogs at \$3.07 $\frac{1}{2}$, 2,600 pieces 7 lbs. Blue Lion at \$1.98, 2,700 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Cook at \$2.37 $\frac{1}{2}$, 4,200 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Blue Joss B. at \$3.02 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,500 pieces 10 lbs. Palm at \$4, 750 pieces 10 lbs. Blue Triangle at \$3.88 $\frac{1}{2}$, 600 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Green Peach at \$2.50, 600 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Red Peach at \$2.67 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,200 pieces 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. Blue Peach at \$3, 500 pieces 10 lbs. Blue 7 Boys at \$3.4 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces 10 lbs. Moon and Cock at \$3.47 $\frac{1}{2}$. White Shirtings—500 pieces Flower at \$4.90, 1,000 pieces S. S. at \$4.60, 300 pieces S. Q. at \$4.42 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,500 pieces Gold Goose at \$4.32 $\frac{1}{2}$, 4,500 pieces No. 300 at \$3.62 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces No. 3 at \$3.52 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,000 pieces No. 600 at \$1.37 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces S. O. at \$4.20, 500 pieces Flower at \$4.90, 300 pieces Blue Lion at \$5.90, 250 pieces No. 1,000 at \$3.52 $\frac{1}{2}$, 250 pieces No. 500 at \$3.32 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,000 pieces Blue Dragon at \$5.15, 500 pieces Gold Dragon at \$5.4 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces X. 6 at \$3.77 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces X. 9 at \$4.60, 1,000 pieces Gold Elephant at \$3.90, 500 pieces No. 500 at \$3.42 $\frac{1}{2}$, 500 pieces No. 1 at \$3.17 $\frac{1}{2}$. T. Cloths—500 pieces 30 in. lbs. Mexican Gold Horse at \$2.70 500 pieces 30 in. lbs. Bear at \$2.90, 700 pieces 7 lbs. Mexican Feather Brush at \$2, 600 pieces 8 lbs. Hunter and Stag C.C. at \$3.12 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1,500 pieces 7 lbs. Mexican Gold Dragon at \$2.35, 3,000 pieces Mexican Silver Lion No. 2 at \$1.98, 750 pieces 7 lbs. Mexican Blue Dragon at \$2.35, 600 pieces 8 lbs. Mexican X. M. at \$2.42 $\frac{1}{2}$, 600 pieces 8 lbs. Red Stag at \$2.75, 750 pieces 7 lbs. Red Stag at \$2.42 $\frac{1}{2}$. Long Ells—500 pieces 9 lbs. Scarlet at \$7.35.

METALS.—Quicksilver—50 flasks at \$125.

COTTON YARN.

Bombay—Nos. 10 to 20\$82.00 to 104.00
English—Nos. 16 to 21100.00 to 117.00
" 22 to 24115.00 to 120.00
" 28 to 32120.00 to 127.00
" 34 to 42133.00 to 140.00

COTTON PIECE GOODS.

Grey Shirtings—6lbs. 1.60 to 1.70
7lbs. 1.95 to 2.12 $\frac{1}{2}$
8 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. 2.30 to 3.10
9 to 10 lbs. 3.25 to 4.10
White Shirtings—54 to 56 rd. 2.25 to 2.45
58 to 60 " 2.60 to 3.20
64 to 66 " 3.20 to 3.75
Fine 4.00 to 7.00
Book-folds. 3.50 to 5.40
Victoria Lawns—12 yards ... 0.65 to 1.30
T. Cloths—6lbs. (32 in.), Ord'y. 1.45 to 1.60
7lbs. (32 ") 1.85 to 2.10
6lbs. (32 "), Mexs. 1.65 to 1.80
7lbs. (32 ") 2.10 to 2.85
8 to 8.4 oz., (36 in.) 2.35 to 3.15
Drills, English—40 yds., 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 14lbs. 3.70 to 5.00

FANCY COTTONS

Turkey Red Shirtings—1 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 5lbs. 1.40 to 3.50
Brocades—Dyed 3.75 to 4.50
Damasks 0.11 to 0.15
Chintzes—Assorted 0.07 to 0.10
Velvets—Black, 22 in. 0.19 to 0.30
Velveteens—18 in. 0.17 to 0.20
Handkerchiefs—Imitation Silk 0.40 to 0.80

WOOLLENS

Spanish Stripes—Sundry chops. 0.60 to 1.20
German 1.08 to 1.35
Habit, Med., and Broad Cloths. 1.32 to 4.70
Long Ells—Scarlet 6.80 to 8.70
Assorted 6.90 to 8.80
Camlets—Assorted 13.00 to 32.00
Lastings—30 yds., 31 inches, Assorted } 11.00 to 20.00
Orleans—Plain 3.40 to 4.20
Blankets—8 to 12lbs. 5.00 to 10.00

METALS

Iron—Nail Rod (Sohier) ... 3.95 to —
Square, Flat Round Bar ... 3.55 to —
Swedish Bar 5.50 to —
Small Round Rod 4.10 to —
Hoop 4.55 to —
Old Wire Rope — to —
Lead, L. B. and Hole Chop ... — to —
Australian 7.55 to 7.60

Yellow M'tal—Muntz, 14/28 oz. — to —
Vivian's, 14/20 oz. 29.25 to —
Elliot's, 14/20 oz. 29.25 to —
Composition Nails 45.00 to —
Japan Copper, Slabs — to —
Tiles — to —

Tin per box.
Tin-Plates 5.85 to —
Steel per cwt. case
4.50 to —

SUNDRIES

Quicksilver per picul
125.00 to —
Window Glass per box
3.90 to —
per 10-gal. case
Kerosene Oil 1.95 to —

SHANGHAI, 15th July.—(From Messrs. Noel, Murray & Co's. Piece Goods Trade Report).—Business, though less in extent than last week from first hands, has continued on much the same lines so far as English goods are concerned, but a considerable trade has been done in American makes both from stock and to arrive, and also between the natives themselves. It is all being done in anticipation of orders from Tientsin and Hankow, and no doubt to some extent to secure the Exchange which was threatening to drop some days before it actually did. There is no special news of interest from our dependencies; the want of rain appears to be the common complaint, on all sides. Clearances, especially of American goods, have been heavy this week. The Auctions have denoted a steady to firm market for Cottons, but Woollens have failed to hold their own for the most part.

METALS.—(From Messrs. Alex. Bielfeld & Co's Report), 16th July.—The past week has been an exceptionally good one; there appears to have been almost a revival of the state of trade which existed early last year. There are many reasons for this condition and the only cause for surprise is that it has not come before. Perhaps the largest factor is the exchange, which now stands at 2s 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ l. weak, while the lowest touched before this has been 2s 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and the feeling seems to be that the bottom has been reached. This has also led to a great many of the contracts being made in silver, as the dealers think that there is no possibility of their having to pay any more, and that they might benefit by the rise. Another factor, which we have been constantly keeping in mind, is the fact that stocks are now getting lower, and it would have been impossible to have waited much longer before placing new orders. These two causes have undoubtedly been the main factors, aided by the better reports from the up-river and northern markets.

CLOSING QUOTATIONS.

TUESDAY, 20th July.

EXCHANGE.

ON LONDON.—
Telegraphic Transfer 1/11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bank Bills, on demand 1/11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bank Bills, at 30 days' sight 1/11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bank Bills, at 4 months' sight 1/11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Credits, at 4 months' sight 1/11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Documentary Bills, 4 months' sight 2/0
ON PARIS.—
Bank Bills, on demand 2.47
Credits, at 4 months' sight 2.51
ON GERMANY.—
On demand 2.00
ON NEW YORK.—
Bank Bills, on demand 48
Credits, 60 days' sight 49
ON BOMBAY.—
Telegraphic Transfer 154 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bank, on demand 155
ON CALCUTTA.—
Telegraphic Transfer 154 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bank, on demand 155
ON SHANGHAI.—
Bank, at sight 73 $\frac{1}{2}$
Private, 30 days' sight 74 $\frac{1}{2}$
ON YOKOHAMA.—
On demand $\frac{1}{2}$ % pm.
ON MANILA.—
On demand $\frac{1}{2}$ % pm.
ON SINGAPORE.—
On demand $\frac{1}{2}$ % pm.
SOVEREIGNS Bank's Buying Rate 10.04
GOLD LEAF, 100 fine, per tael 52.00

JOINT STOCK SHARES.

HONGKONG, 20th July.—The market has continued dull and there is but little business of any importance to report. Rates have in most cases declined or show weakness, and the market closes quiet.

BANKS.—Hongkong and Shanghai.—Notwithstanding the publication of the excellent result of the last six months' working, viz., 25s. dividend, \$500,000 to reserve, and \$300,000 carried forward, the market has continued quiet and shows no improvement in rates. A few lots have changed hands at 188 per cent. prem. for cash, but more shares are probably obtainable at that rate and at equivalent rates on time. Nationals are still enquired for without leading to business. Bank of China neglected.

MARINE INSURANCE.—China Traders have been in demand at \$77, but holders will not part at that rate. Unions have changed hands at quotations, and Cantons have continued on offer at \$180 without finding buyers. Straits remain unchanged with little or no business. The Northern Insurances have changed hands in the North at quotations.

FIRE INSURANCE.—The market has ruled steady, with small sales of Hongkongs at \$360 and of Chinas at \$107.

SHIPPING.—A dull market with but little business. Hongkong, Canton and Macao continue dull and neglected notwithstanding the near approach of the dividend of (probably) \$1.20 per share. Indo-Chinas have been negotiated in small lots at \$51 and \$52, closing with sellers at \$50½. China Manilas, Douglases, and Mutnals close steady at quotations without business.

REFINERIES.—China Sugars have continued quiet and after further sales at \$146 were done at \$145, the market closing quiet in view of of heavy settlements on the 31st instant. Luzons changed hands at \$47 (presumably a forced sale), but more shares could be placed at the rate and none seem to be forthcoming.

MINING.—Punjoms again fell in the early part of the week and sales were effected at \$8, \$7.75, \$7.50, and \$7.25; towards the end, however, a firmer feeling set in and a fair demand springing up shares changed hands in fair lots at \$7.50 and \$7.75, the market closing steady at the latter rate. Nothing definite is yet known about the progress of negotiations with the American Syndicate, but it is believed the Directors have a cut and dried scheme to place before shareholders to which they are favourably inclined. New Balmorals have been weak and have changed hands in small lots at \$1.90 and \$2 for ordinary and preferences. In Jebebus a small business has been put through at quotations. Raubs.—With a regular bombardment of shares from Singapore brought on by tightness of money and the consequent inability of speculators to take up their purchases, the market has ruled weak and declining; a fair number of shares changed hands at \$26 and \$25 and sales are reported at \$24½ at time of closing, the market closing quiet with not much chance of improving until after our settlements on the 31st, when a good many shares at high rates will have to be arranged for. Olivers A have continued quiet and neglected, but a fair business has been done in B's at \$6.25, \$6.10, and \$6, the market closing quiet. The latest news from the mine, whilst reporting a further small crushing of 150 tons yielding ½ oz., states that the mine is now steadily paying its way and that no funds have been needed from Hongkong since the first crushing in March.

DOCKS, WHARVES, AND GODOWNS.—Hongkong and Whampoa Docks have continued quiet and almost without business at 240 to 241 per cent. premium, closing quiet. Kowloon Wharves remain quiet with small sales at \$66½. Wanchais without business.

LANDS, HOTELS, AND BUILDINGS.—Hongkong Lands have been on offer all the week at \$77, without leading to business. Kowloon Lands steady at quotations but without sales. Hotels have been on offer at \$50 without inducing further buyers to come forward. West Points and Humphreys have ruled steady with a small business at quotations.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Green Islands, after sales at \$39 and \$39½, close weaker at \$38½ with sellers. Watsons have been on offer all the week without finding buyers, but at time of closing small

sales have been effected at \$12.60. Electrics have changed hands and close steady at \$7.50. Tramways and Ices continue on offer without business. Ropes and Fenwicks have changed hands at quotations, and Cotton Mills have been neglected and declining without business.

Closing quotations are as follow:—

COMPANY.	PAID UP.	QUOTATION.
Banks—		[\$360, sal. & b. prem.]
Hongkong & S'hai...	\$125	188 ½
China & Japan, prf.	£5	nominal
Do. ordinary...	£1 10s.	nominal
Do. deferred...	£1	£5
Natl. Bank of China		
B. Shares	£8	\$24, sales & buyers
Founders Shares...	£1	\$20
Bell's Asbestos E. A. ...	£1	\$9, sellers
Campbell, Moore & Co.	\$10	\$8
Carmichael & Co.	\$20	\$8
China Sugar	\$100	\$145, sales & sellers
Dairy Farm Co.	\$5	\$6
Ewo Cotton	Tls. 100	Tls. 114, sellers
Fenwick & Co., Geo. ...	\$25	\$27½, sales & buyers
Green Island Cement...	\$10	\$38½, sales & sellers
H. & China Bakery ...	\$50	\$33, buyers
Hongkong & C. Gas ...	\$10	\$110, buyers
Hongkong Electric ...	\$8	\$7.50, sal. & sellers
H. H. L. Tramways ...	\$100	\$15, sellers
Hongkong Hotel	\$50	\$50, sales & sellers
Hongkong Ice	\$25	\$115
H. & K. Wharf & G. ...	\$50	\$66½
Hongkong Rope	\$50	\$172, sellers
H. & W. Dock	\$125	240 p. ct. prem. =
Insurances—		[\$425]
Canton	\$50	\$190, sellers
China Fire	\$20	\$107, sales & sellers
China Traders'	\$25	\$77, buyers
Hongkong Fire	\$50	\$360, buyers
North-China	£25	Tls. 185, sellers
Straits	\$20	\$17½, sales
Union	\$25	\$227½, buyers
Yangtze	\$60	\$155, buyers
Land and Building—		
H. Land Investment...	\$50	\$77, sales & sellers
Humphreys Estate...	\$10	\$9½, sales
Kowloon Land & B. ...	\$30	\$2½, sellers
West Point Building	\$40	\$22½, sales & sellers
Luzon Sugar	\$100	\$47, buyers
Mining—		
Charbonnages	Fcs. 500	\$90, sales
Jebebu	\$5	\$2.10, sal. & buyers
New Balmoral	\$1	\$1.70, sales
Do. Preference	\$1	\$1.90, sal. & buyers
Oliver's Mines, A. ...	\$5	\$20, sellers
Do. B. ...	\$2½	\$6½, sales & sellers
Punjom	\$4	\$7.85, sales & sellers
Do. Preference...	\$1	\$2.30, sellers
Raubs	13s. 10d.	\$24½, sal. & buyers
Great E. & Caledonian	\$5	\$5½, sellers
Do. Do.	\$2½	\$2.60, sal. & sellers
New Amoy Dock	\$10	\$19, sales
Steamship Coys.—		
China and Manila ...	\$50	\$7½, sellers
China Mutual Ord...	£5	£2 10s.
Do. Preference...	£10	£7, buyers
Douglas S. S. Co. ...	\$50	\$67, sellers
H. Canton and M. ...	\$15	\$34½, sales & sellers
Indo-China S. N. ...	\$10	\$50½, sales & sellers
Wanchai Warehouse Co.	\$37½	\$44½
Watson & Co., A. S. ...	\$10	\$12 60, sales

J. Y. V. VERNON, Broker.

SHANGHAI, 16th July.—(From Messrs. J. P. Bisset & Co.'s Report.)—The market has been fairly active during the week, and prices have generally been well maintained, with improvement in some cases. Banks.—Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation.—Cash shares have changed hands at 192½ per cent. premium, and a sale was reported at 193 for the 31st current. The market is quiet, with a disposition to sell. National Bank shares have changed hands in Hongkong at \$23½. Marine Insurance.—Business has been confined to North-Chinas which were placed at Tls. 190, and Yangtszes which were sold at \$159 cash, and \$160 for delivery on the 31st current. Fire Insurance.—Chinas have been placed to Hongkong at \$106½ cash, and \$107 for delivery on the 30th September. There is no business reported in Hongkongs. Shipping.—Indo-China Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. Shares have been changing hands at Tls. 37 cash, Tls. 37½ for the 31st current, Tls. 38½ for October, and Tls. 39 for December. Cash shares were also sold to Hongkong at \$51, which is equal to Tls. 37.50, and this we quote as the closing rate. Sugar Companies.—Perak Sugar Cultivation shares are wanted at Tls. 35, but are held for Tls. 38. China Sugar Refining shares were sold for cash at \$147, and were purchased locally at \$151 for August delivery, and from Hongkong at \$149 for the same date. Mining.—Olivers

Freehold Mines B shares were sold to Hongkong at \$6. Dock, Wharves and Godowns.—Boyd & Co. shares were placed at Tls. 210, Shanghai Engineering and Dock shares at Tls. 107, and Shanghai and Hongkew Wharf shares at Tls. 122½. Lands.—Shanghai Land Investment shares have been sold at Tls. 87½ cum and Tls. 85½ ex the dividend of 4½ per cent. payable on the 19th current. A few more shares are offering on the same terms, ex dividend. Hongkong Land shares are offering there at \$77. Industrial.—Ewo Cotton shares were placed for cash at Tls. 115 locally and at Tls. 116 to Hongkong, and a sale for August delivery is reported at Tls. 117½. Internationals changed hands at Tls. 1212, Laou-kung-mows at Tls. 120 cash and Tls. 121 for the 31st current, Shanghai Ice shares at Tls. 125, Shanghai Rice Mill shares at Tls. 30, China Flour Mill shares at Tls. 52½ and Tls. 53, and American Cigarette shares at Tls. 80 and Tls. 82½. Tugs & Cargo Boats.—Business is reported in Taku Tug and lighter shares at Tls. 121 cum and Tls. 115 ex dividend. Miscellaneous.—Shanghai Waterworks shares changed hands at Tls. 310, cum the dividend of 15 shilling per share declared payable on the 26th at exchange 2/8. Shanghai-Sumatra Tobacco shares have been sold for cash at Tls. 105 to Tls. 102, for August at Tls. 108, for October at Tls. 111/110, and for December at Tls. 112½. Shanghai-Langkai Tobacco shares have been recovering, and cash sales were made at Tls. 475 to Tls. 510, for July at Tls. 500, for August at Tls. 525, for October at Tls. 535/545, and for December at Tls. 530 Tls. 560 and 580. Loans.—Shanghai and Hongkew Wharf 6 per cent. Debentures were placed at Tls. 105, Shanghai-Langkai Tobacco Company's 10 per cent. Debentures at Tls. 100, and Shanghai-Sumatra Company's 8 per cent. Debentures at Tls. 105, plus the accrued interest in all cases. Quotations are:—

Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation. —\$365.6.
Bank of China, Japan, and The Straits, Limited, deferred shares.—£5.
Bank of China, Japan, and The Straits, Limited, ordinary shares.—Nominal.
National Bank of China, Ltd.—\$23.
National Bank of China, Ltd., Founders.—\$20.
Union Insurance Society of Canton, Ltd.—\$227½.
China Traders' Insurance Co., Ltd.—\$77.
North China Insurance Co., Ltd.—Tls. 190.00.
Yangtze Insce. Assocn., Ltd.—\$150.
Canton Insurance Office, Ltd.—\$182½.
Straits Insurance Co., Ltd.—\$18.
Hongkong Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.—\$352½.
China Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.—\$107½.
Hongkong, Canton and Macao Steamboat Co. —\$33½.
Indo-China Steam N. Co., Ltd.—Tls. 37.50.
Douglas Steamship Co., Ltd.—\$66.
China-Mutual Steam Nav. Co. pref. shares.—Tls. 50.00.
China-Mutual Steam Nav. Co. ord. shares.—Tls. 22.00.
Perak Sugar Cultivation Co., Ltd.—Tls. 38.00.
China Sugar Refining Co., Ltd.—\$147.
Luzon Sugar Refining Co., Ltd.—\$50.
Sheridan Consolidated Mining and Milling Company, Limited.—Tls. 2.50.
Punjom Mining Co., Ltd.—\$6½.
Punjom Mining Co., Ltd., pref. shares.—\$1.85.
Jebebu Mining & Trading Co., Ltd.—\$2.25.
Raub Australian Gold Min. Co., Ltd.—\$30.
Bord & Co., Ltd., Founders.—Nominal.
Boyd & Co., Limited.—Tls. 210.00.
S. C. Farnham & Co.—Tls. 185.00.
Hongkong and Whampoa Dock Co., Ltd.—\$423½.
Shanghai & Hongkew Wharf Co.—Tls. 122.50.
Hongkong and Kowloon Wharf and Godown Company, Limited.—\$67½.
Shanghai Land Investment Co., Ltd. (fully paid) —Tls. 87.75.
Hongkong Land Invest. & A. Co., Ltd.—\$77½.
Kowloon Land & Building Co., Ltd.—\$19.
Humphreys Estate and Finance Co., Ltd.—\$9.
Shanghai Gas Co.—Tls. 230.00.
Major Brothers, Limited.—Tls. 42.50.
Ewo Cotton Spinning & W. Co., Ltd.—Tls. 115.00.
International Cotton Man. Co., Ltd.—Tls. 122.00.
Laou-kung-mow Cotton Spinning and Weaving Co., Ltd.—Tls. 120.00.
Soy Chee Cotton Spinning Co., Ltd.—Tls. 600.00.
Shanghai Ice Company—Tls. 125.00.
Shanghai Tugboat Co., Ltd.—Tls. 215.00.
Taku Tug & Lighter Co., Ltd.—Tls. 115.00.
Shanghai Cargo Boat Co.—Tls. 190.00.
Co-operative Cargo Boat Co.—Tls. 175.00.
Shanghai Waterworks Co., Ltd.—Tls. 310.00.
Shanghai Sumatra Tobacco Co.—Tls. 102.00.
Shanghai Langkat Tobacco Co., Ltd.—Tls. 510.00.
Shanghai Horse Bazaar Co., Ltd.—Tls. 76.00.
J. Llewellyn & Co., Limited.—\$75.00.

Hall & Hertz, Ltd.—\$41.50.
A. S. Watson Co., Limited.—\$12.50.
Bell's Asbestos Eastern Agency, Ltd.—\$9.00.
Hongkong Electric Co., Ltd.—\$3.00.

VESSELS ON THE BERTH.

For LONDON.—*Malacca* (str.), *Orestes* (str.), *Benvenue* (str.), *Mirapora* (str.), *Glengarry* (str.).
For SAN FRANCISCO.—*Heathbank*, *Coptic* (str.), *City of Rio de Janeiro* (str.).
For VANCOUVER.—*Empress of Japan* (str.).
For NEW YORK.—*Argyll* (str.), *Fortuna* (str.), *Landseer*.
For MARSEILLES.—*Hakata Maru* (str.), *Elaz* (str.).
For SOUTH AFRICA.—*Pongola* (str.).
For AUSTRALIA.—*Yamashiro Maru* (str.).
For TACOMA.—*Columbia* (str.).
For PORTLAND.—*Monmouthshire* (str.).

TONNAGE.

SHANGHAI, 16th July (from Messrs. Wheelock & Co.'s report).—Continued dullness and "nothing doing" seems to be the general verdict among shippers, and consequently steamers are receiving very indifferent support homewards, although the market has been kept well supplied with tonnage during the past fortnight. Coast rates have likewise declined, but this is due to the usual slackness at this time of year. For London *via* Suez.—This direction seems almost lifeless, judging from the amount of cargo going forward; steamers have called here regularly as advertised, but no support of any consequence seems forthcoming. For New York *via* Cape.—For a steamer in Hongkong 17s., and in Japan 16s. is asked for a through rate, but prospects of any vessel being fixed to load here are very remote. Rates of freight are:—London, by Conference Lines, general cargo 35s.; waste silk 37s. 6d.; tea 40s.; Northern Continental ports, by Conference Lines, general cargo 35s.; waste silk 37s. 6d.; tea 40s.; New York *via* London, by Conference Lines, general cargo 42s. 6d.; waste silk 45s.; tea 47s. 6d.; Baltimore *via* London, by Conference Lines, general cargo 47s. 6d.; waste silk 50s.; tea 52s. 6d.; Königsberg *via* London, by Conference Lines, general cargo 42s. 6d.; waste silk 45s.; tea 47s. 6d.; Manchester, by Conference Lines, general cargo 47s. 6d.; waste silk 50s.; tea 52s. 6d.; Liverpool, by Conference Lines, general cargo 42s. 6d.; waste silk 45s.; tea 47s. 6d.; Hamburg, by Conference Lines, general cargo 35s.; waste silk 37s. 6d.; tea 40s. Above rates are subject to a deferred return, as per Conference circular. Havre, by Conference Lines, tallow 32s. 6d. net, general cargo 32s. 6d. net, waste silk 35s. net, tea 37s. 6d. net; Genoa, by Conference Lines, tallow 32s. 6d. net, general cargo 32s. 6d. net, waste silk 35s. net, tea 37s. 6d. net; Marseilles, by Conference Lines, tallow 32s. 6d. net, general cargo 32s. 6d. net, waste silk 35s. net, tea 37s. 6d. net. 42s. 6d. per ton of 20 cwt. for above three ports.

SHIPPING.

ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES SINCE LAST MAIL.

HONGKONG.

July—

ARRIVALS.

14, Fushun, Chinese str., from Shanghai.
15, Szechuen, British str., from Tientsin.
15, Kong Beng, British str., from Bangkok.
15, Nanshan, British str., from Saigon.
15, Omi Maru, Jap. str., from Australia.
15, Deuteros, German str., from Saigon.
15, Sabine Rickmers, Ger. str., from Amoy.
15, Glenfalloch, British str., from Straits.
16, Sungkiang, British str., from Manila.
16, Progress German str., from Quinhon.
16, Afridi, British str., from Foochow.
16, Haitan, British str., from Coast Ports.
16, Hikosan Maru, Jap. str., from K'notzu.
16, Sullberg, German str., from Chefoo.
16, Doike Rickmers, German str., from Moji.
16, Chunsang, British str., from Samarang.
17, Catherine Apcar, Brit. str., from Calcutta.
17, Salazie, French str., from Marseilles.
17, Yuensang, British str., from Manila.
17, Frejre, Danish str., from Haiphong.
17, Haitan, French str., from Pakhoi.
17, Chingping, Chinese str., from Tientsin.
17, Ingraban, German str., from Saigon.
17, Tordenskjold, Norw. str., from Singapore.
17, Willkommen, German ship, from Cardiff.
18, Ariake Maru, Jap. str., from K'notzu.

18, Formosa, British str., from Tamsui.
18, Hanoi, French str., from Haiphong.
18, Hansa, German str., from Mororan.
18, Hohenzollern, Ger. str., from Yokohama.
18, Mount Lebanon, Brit. str., from P. Blakely.
18, Prometheus, British str., from Liverpool.
18, Onsang, British str., from Moji.
18, Cosmopolit, German str., from Canton.
18, Fushun, Chinese str., from Canton.
18, Nanchang, British str., from Canton.
18, Taisang, British str., from Canton.
18, Mathilde, German str., from Haiphong.
18, Changsha, British str., from Yokohama.
19, Sullberg, German str., from Canton.
19, Clara, German str., from Haiphong.
19, Szechuen, British str., from Canton.
19, Sachsen, German str., from Shanghai.
19, Peiyang, German str., from Wuhu.
19, Irene, German str., from Hamburg.
19, Glenloch, British str., from Singapore.
19, Loongmoon, German str., from Canton.
19, Holstein, German str., from Moji.
19, Triumph, German str., from Hoihow.
19, Kachidate Maru, Jap. str., from K'notzu.
19, Krim, Norw. str., from Hongay.
19, Trocas, British str., from Moji.
20, Oceanien, French str., from Shanghai.
20, Glenogle, British str., from London.
20, Kwongsang, British str., from Wuhu.
20, Brindisi, British str., from Kobe.
20, Haitan, British str., from Swatow.
20, Benvenue, British str., from Foochow.

July—

DEPARTURES.

15, Triumph, German str., for Hoihow.
15, Benlarig, British str., for Kobe.
15, Loongmoon, German str., for Canton.
15, Mazagon, British str., for Kobe.
15, Taisang, British str., for Canton.
15, Cosmopolit, German str., for Canton.
15, C. H. Kian, British str., for Swatow.
15, Fushun, Chinese str., for Canton.
15, Keongwai, British str., for Yokohama.
15, Loyal, German str., for Canton.
15, Namoa, British str., for Swatow.
15, Peru, Amr. str., for San Francisco.
15, Ravenna, British str., for Europe.
15, Sishan, British str., for Hongay.
15, Szechuen, British str., for Canton.
16, Carmarthenshire, British str., for London.
16, Chusan, German str., for Cebu.
16, Verona, British str., for Yokohama.
17, Sullberg, German str., for Canton.
17, Phoenix, British cruiser, for Tamsui.
17, China, German str., for Saigon.
17, Glenfalloch, British str., for Amoy.
17, Katsang, British str., for Calcutta.
18, Asloun, British str., for Kobe.
18, Hailong, British str., for Swatow.
18, Haitan, British str., for Swatow.
18, Sabine Rickmers, Ger. str., for Swatow.
18, Salazie, French str., for Shanghai.
18, Sungkiang, British str., for Manila.
18, Bidston Hill, British ship, for Manila.
18, Torresdale, British bark, for Australia.
19, Rose, British bark, for Puget Sound.
19, Frejre, Danish str., for Haiphong.
19, Plover, British g-bt., for Singapore.
19, Omi Maru, Jap. str., for Nagasaki.
19, Peiyang, German str., for Canton.
20, Szechuen, British str., for Shanghai.
20, Asloun, British str., for Kobe.
20, Orient, German bark, for Valparaiso.
20, Afridi, British str., for Australia.
20, Hikosan Maru, Jap. str., for K'chinotzu.
20, Kong Beng, British str., for Bangkok.
20, Kwongsang, British str., for Canton.
20, Loyal, German str., for Hakodate.
20, Esmeralda, British str., for Manila.
20, Formosa, British str., for Swatow.
20, Fushun, Chinese str., for Shanghai.
20, Haitan, French str., for Hoihow.
20, Hanoi, French str., for Haiphong.
20, Krim, Norw. str., for Canton.
20, Mathilde, German str., for Hoihow.
20, Nanchang, British str., for Tientsin.
20, Prometheus, British str., for Shanghai.
20, Sachsen, German str., for Europe.
20, Sullberg, German str., for Chefoo.

PASSENGER LIST.

ARRIVED.

Per *Empress of Japan*, str., from Vancouver—Mr. G. R. Akan, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Yan Yow and 4 children. From Yokohama—Mrs. Gordon, Miss Reynier, Miss Moate, Mrs. Ross and 3 children, Miss Bailey, Mr. O. Liman, Lieut. A. C. M. Head, Capt. Parsons, Mr. B. C. W.

Williams, Mrs. Parsons and child. From Nagasaki—Mr. Jas. Harvie. From Shanghai—Messrs. J. McKie, Wong Pok Hin, Lum Hong Lan, T. Kaniand, S. Niragama.

Per *Thales*, str., from Taiwanfoo, &c.—Mr. and Mrs. G. Ede, Mr. W. J. Kenny.

Per *Taisang*, str., from Shanghai, &c.—Messrs Underwood and Hillier.

Per *Loongmoon*, str., from Shanghai—Messrs. A. Krumme, J. Jurgens, and E. Hubbard.

Per *Kong Beng*, str., from Bangkok—Mr. Lindsay and Dr. Nightingale.

Per *Omi Maru*, str., from Australia for Hongkong—Messrs. G. W. Hope Johnstone and B. G. Greig. For Japan—Messrs. A. Richard, S. Weinrig, Mrs. Gordon and 2 children, Messrs. K. Hara, K. Kadota, M. Jenkins, and W. Matfin.

Per *Esmeralda*, str., from Manila—Miss T. Hoffer, Messrs. Ram, H. Grosser, G. Hadden, F. Stang, E. Haria, C. Martin, D. Schwartzing, H. Martens, E. Grette, and Rev. E. Aluven.

Per *Haitan*, str., from Coast Ports—Mr. Telune.

Per *Catherine Apcar*, str., from Calcutta.—Lt.-Col. and Mrs. Turnbull, and 573 Chinese.

Per *Yuen Sang*, str., from Manila.—Mr. Smith Alliston.

Per *Salazie*, steamer, for Hongkong from Marseilles.—Mr. and Mrs. Alfredo de Azulo and children. For Shanghai.—Messrs. Debrabant, Colomb, G. Marting, and Rev. P. Sebastien Geoberte. For Yokohama.—Messrs. Nicolas Bobone, Seminnanikof, and Mrs. Francois and infant. For Hongkong from Singapore.—Messrs. Seeh Guan, Sia Yung Kim, Lao Seng Guan, J. M. B. Medina and Chong Soo Leong. For Yokohama.—Messrs. C. André, F. Wynen, Mrs. Torche and infant. For Hongkong from Saigon.—Mr. Guilloise. For Shanghai.—Messrs. Dreyon, Latray, Reste, Mr. and Mrs. Nezkedosky, and 163 Chinese.

Per *Hohenzollern*, str., from Japan—Mr. P. Stoppa, Mrs. Hoofe, Miss Baorelt, Miss Rogers, Professor D. Kosh, Mr. J. Leimfelder, Capt. Whale, Messrs. Jas. Logan, Jas. Brown, Murid, henk, and H. Trachenberg.

Per *Irene*, str., from Hamburg, &c.—Messrs. Haase and Teske.

Per *Sachsen*, str., from Shanghai for Hongkong—Messrs. H. King, F. Kysh, K. Walsh, Mr. and Mrs. Spector and children. For Europe—Messrs. O. Aschbrenner, J. Faust, M. Paine, Capt. B. Rafen, Messrs. W. Grundmann, O. Pedersen, Th. Hüber, M. Pederson, J. Onale, and Zitzewitz.

DEPARTED.

Per *Ravenna*, str., from Hongkong for Singapore—Sisters Emilia and Maria. For Penang—Mr. and Mrs. Graham. For Bombay—Mr. A. G. Basrai. For London—Mr. F. S. A. Bourne, Mr. and Miss Kyles, Messrs. F. W. Vanstone, Liddell, and Jas. Harvie. From Yokohama for Singapore—Mr. E. Shepherd. For Calcutta—Madame Monlard. For London—Miss Lock. From Shanghai for Brindisi—Mr. G. Madge, and Rev. D. A. Stearns. For London—Mr. D. Smith.

Per *Peru*, str., for Shanghai—Mr. T. W. Ogilvy, Rev. and Mrs. J. G. Kerr. For Kobe—Mr. A. Ellis. For Yokohama—Capt. C. B. Little, Surg.-Capt. Edye, and W. J. Kenny. For San Francisco—Mr. J. M. Littlehale.

Per *Verona*, str., from Hongkong for Kobe—Mr. L. David. For Yokohama—Surgeon J. C. Durston, R.N., Mr. L. L. Bailey, and Captain Stopani. For Yokohama from London—Mr. and Mrs. Smith. From Brindisi—Mr. T. Southall. From Singapore—Mr. Phillips.

Per *Salazie*, str., for Shanghai—Messrs. L. Méchelot, L. Stang, Machida, Enoch Binks Mr. and Mrs. E. Stoffer. For Kobe—Mr. P. Weinlig. For Yokohama—Mr. and Miss Bonneau.

Per *Omi Maru*, str., for Japan—Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Parker, Mrs. L. Farias, Mrs. Mary Farias and child, Messrs. Richard Weinrig, Hara, Mrs. Gordon and 2 children, Messrs. Martin, Jenkins, Kadota, King Hoon, and Nuzzar.

Printed and Published by D. WARREN SMITH, at 29, Wyndham Street, Victoria, Hongkong.